

JAN 14 1922

JAN 14 1922
UNIV. OF MICH.

The American Historical Review

Board of Editors

CARL BECKER

ARCHIBALD C. COOLIDGE

WILLIAM E. DODD

GUY S. FORD

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

WILLISTON WALKER

Managing Editor

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOL. XXVII NO. 2

JANUARY, 1922

ISSUED QUARTERLY

CONTENTS

DEXTER PERKINS	Europe, Spanish America, and the Monroe Doctrine	207
H. NELSON GAY	Garibaldi's Sicilian Campaign as reported by an American Diplomat	219
HERBERT D. FOSTER	Webster's Seventh of March Speech and the Secession Movement, 1850	243
DOCUMENT—	Washington in 1834: Letter of Robert C. Caldwell, contributed by George M. Whicher	271
REVIEWS OF BOOKS—	Ein's <i>The Meise</i> ; Huttenstein and Reif's <i>Commons Debates for 1829</i> ; Proust's <i>Histoire de Belgique</i> , V.; Lavisse's <i>Histoire de France Contemporaine</i> , I-VII; Windischgrast's <i>My Memoirs</i> ; Gathorne-Hardy's <i>The North Discoverers of America</i> ; Burnett's <i>Letters of Members of the Continental Congress</i> , I.; Deit's <i>Woodrow Wilson and His Work</i>	282

(For a complete list of reviews see next page.)

HISTORICAL NEWS

359

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

41 NORTH QUEEN STREET, LANCASTER, PA.

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Entered at the post-office, Lancaster, Pa., as second-class mail matter

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Marvin, <i>The Evolution of World-Peace</i> , by Dr. C. H. Levermore.....	282
Pala, <i>Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani</i> , by Professor R. V. D. Magoffin.....	284

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Klein, <i>The Meris</i> , by Professor C. E. Chapman.....	285
Pieris, <i>Ceylon and the Portuguese, 1505-1638</i> , by Professor E. W. Hopkins.....	287
Rodocanachi, <i>La Riforme en Italie</i> , by Dr. F. C. Church.....	288
Wittke, <i>The History of English Parliamentary Privilege</i> , by Professor R. L. Schuyler.....	290
Notestein and Reif, <i>Commons Debates for 1629</i> , by Professor A. L. Cross.....	292
Pirenne, <i>Histoire de Belgique</i> , V., by Professor Theodore Collier.....	294
Foote, <i>The English Factories in India, 1655-1660, and Early Travels in India, 1585-1619</i> , by Professor W. C. Abbott.....	296
Taylor, <i>The Wars of Marlborough, 1702-1709</i> , by Brig.-Gen. E. A. Cruikshank.....	298
Koser, <i>Zur Preussischen und Deutschen Geschichte</i> , by Professor G. S. Ford.....	300
Sagnac and Pariset, <i>Lavisse's Histoire de France Contemporaine</i> , I, II., by Professor H. E. Bourne.....	301
Pariset, <i>Lavisse's Histoire de France Contemporaine</i> , III., by Professor W. E. Lingelbach.....	304
Charl��ty and Seignobos, <i>Lavisse's Histoire de France Contemporaine</i> , IV.-VII., by Professor F. M. Fling.....	306
Sartorius, <i>Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 1813-1914</i> , by Professor Clive Day.....	308
Moon, <i>The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France</i> , by Professor F. M. Anderson.....	310
Turner, <i>Europe since 1870</i> , by Professor E. E. Sperry.....	311
Conybeare, <i>Russian Dissenters</i> , by Professor M. Rostovtzeff.....	313
Raymond, <i>Portraits of the Nineties</i>	315
Stuart, <i>French Foreign Policy from Fashoda to Sarajevo</i> , by Professor L. B. Packard.....	317
Windischgratz, <i>My Memoirs</i> , by Professor S. B. Fay.....	318
Chester, <i>Life of Venizelos</i> , by Professor W. A. Oldfather.....	320
Stoddard, <i>The New World of Islam</i> , by Professor A. H. Lybyer.....	322

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Gathorne-Hardy, <i>The Norse Discoverers of America</i> , by Professor J. E. Olson.....	325
Mayo, John Wentworth, <i>Governor of New Hampshire 1763-1773</i> , by Professor H. D. Foster.....	326
Burnett, <i>Letters of Members of the Continental Congress</i> , I., by Professor C. H. Van Tyne.....	328
Berdahl, <i>War Powers of the Executive in the United States</i>	329
Bell, <i>Opening a Highway to the Pacific, 1838-1846</i> , by Dr. Joseph Schaf��r.....	331
Howland, <i>Theodore Roosevelt and his Times</i> , by Professor F. L. Paxson.....	333
Seymour, <i>Woodrow Wilson and the World War</i> , by the same.....	334
Dodd, <i>Woodrow Wilson and His Work</i> , by Professor E. S. Corwin.....	334
MINOR NOTICES.....	337

The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW to all its members; the Executive Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW may be sent to the Managing Editor, J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., or to the Board of Editors. Books for review may be sent to the Managing Editor. Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 41 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa., or 66 Fifth Ave., New York. The price of subscription, to persons who are not members of the American Historical Association, is six dollars a year; single numbers are sold for \$1.50 (back numbers at the same rate); bound volumes may be obtained for six dollars, up to and including vol. XXV. Volumes after that number may be obtained for \$7.50.

COPYRIGHT, 1919, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

PRINTED BY
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

The American Historical Review

EUROPE, SPANISH AMERICA, AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

THE policy of the European powers in the question of the Spanish colonies, the train of events leading up to the famous pronunciamiento known as the Monroe Doctrine, and the effects of that declaration upon the course of contemporary politics, are no new subjects of discussion. The diplomatic action of Great Britain, the deliberations at Washington, have received detailed examination,¹ and of late years much has been done to define more accurately the attitude of the Continental powers.²

But on the latter side the details have not yet been filled in, nor the principles of action determined with exactitude. Just how great was the danger of intervention in the colonies? Exactly what was the positive policy of France, of Russia, of Austria? How far did the United States enter into the calculations of European statesmen? These are questions which deserve a fuller answer than they have yet received.

In such a study it will be desirable to examine only the period between March, 1822, when President Monroe declared for the recognition of the colonies, and June, 1824, by which time the colonial question had ceased to occupy the centre of the European stage. The attitude of the powers at a later period has been clearly shown by documents already published in this *Review* (XXII. 595-616).

¹ On the British side the best special article is by Col. E. M. Lloyd, "Canning and Spanish America", *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, n. s., vol. XVIII., pp. 891 ff. On the American side special attention may be called to the two articles by Mr. W. C. Ford in *Amer. Hist. Rev.*, "John Quincy Adams and the Monroe Doctrine", VII. 676-696, VIII. 53-77.

² See Professor W. S. Robertson's two articles, one in this *Review*, XX. 781-800, on "The United States and Spain, 1822", and the other in *Amer. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, VI. 546-563, "The Monroe Doctrine abroad in 1823-1824". Also A. Rousseau, "L'Ambassade du Marquis de Talaru en Espagne. Juillet 1823-Août 1824", in *Rev. des Questions Historiques*, XC. 86-116.

The Continental power with the greatest interest in Spanish America was France. She alone, indeed, of the group loosely known as the Holy Alliance, can be said to have had colonial matters almost constantly in view during the period which it is the business of this paper to examine. An examination of the diplomatic correspondence in four foreign offices, at London, at Paris, at Vienna, and at Petrograd, reveals the fact that Prussia was at all times indifferent; that Austria and Russia began to take an active interest in the South American problem only after October, 1823; but that France was, at a far earlier date, vitally interested in the fate of the revolted dominions of Spain.

French policy in the matter of the colonies reveals from the beginning conflicting interests and points of view which have been too little recognized. No sufficient emphasis has ever been placed on the attitude of the French merchant classes toward the question of Spanish America. There was, as early as 1821, a strong and insistent demand that the markets of Spanish America be opened to French enterprise. There was a considerable body of opinion which looked forward to the recognition of the independence of the colonies as the solution of the whole problem. And this body of opinion, while it did not determine French policy, was always an element to be reckoned with.³

It had, too, its representative in the government. Joachim de Villèle, prime minister during the whole period under review, though a reactionary, was a reactionary of a very practical type. Commerce and finance held the first place in his mind. More than once in his letters the recognition of the colonies is advocated, though often in terms discreetly veiled.⁴

Very different, however, was the view of Montmorency, minister of foreign affairs till December, 1822, and of Chateaubriand, his successor. These men were not indifferent to the pressure of the merchants, they never advocated the forcible reconquest of the colonies, but they were entirely unwilling to admit the possibility of action in the colonial question independent of the wishes of Spain, and in disregard of legitimist principle.

In line with the divergent views of Villèle and his ministers, two policies lay open to France. She might seek an understanding with

³ Paris, Arch. des Aff. Étr., Mém. et Docs., vol. 35, f. 161; undated, must be of about January, 1822. This memoir reveals the fact that agents are to be sent out "to open in the states of South America markets for the products of France, and to make clear the means by which solid commercial relations may be established".

⁴ Joachim de Villèle, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1888-1890), III, 69 *et passim*.

Great Britain, whose commercial interests led her to favor the cause of colonial independence, and march side by side with that power. Or, on the other hand, she might seek an understanding and a settlement of another kind in concert with the Continental powers.

There was here a real choice which lay open. The possibility of an accord with the British government has been too little emphasized. As a practical matter of fact, on no less than three occasions the London Foreign Office made clear its desire for such an accord.

The first of these occasions was in April, 1822. The date suggests that the advances then made may very possibly have been prompted by the virtual recognition of the colonies by the American government in March. At any rate, at this time Lord Castlereagh, then foreign minister, proposed that France and England should consult together, and co-operate in the solution of the Spanish-American question. If some *de facto* recognition of the new states became necessary, such action ought to be concerted between the two governments.⁵

There was much to be said for this proposal. Its acceptance might have altered the whole aspect of the colonial problem, and indeed of European politics in general. But a meeting of the French council of ministers, held forthwith, determined upon rejection. The necessity of common action with the allies, the fear of offending Spain, were given as the reasons for this decision.⁶

A new occasion for a Franco-British understanding, however, was offered at the Congress of Verona. There the Duke of Wellington presented a memorandum on the colonial problem emphasizing the necessity of protecting commerce in the New World, hinting at recognition, and inviting the observations of the allied powers. He seems, too, to have definitely suggested an accord to Chateaubriand. But no accord resulted. On the contrary, the French reply actually committed France to co-operation with the allies, declaring that "a general measure taken in common by the cabinets of Europe would be the most desirable."⁷

After this declaration at Verona, it was virtually impossible for the French ministers to reverse their attitude. A third offer of co-operation, made by Canning on the eve of the Polignac interview, was at once rebuffed. The settlement of the colonial question by a congress of the powers had now become avowedly the basic principle of

⁵ Paris, *Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre*, vol. 615, f. 204, May 7, 1822.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 211, May 13, 1822.

⁷ Chateaubriand, *Congrès de Vérone* (Paris, 1838), I. 94.

French policy. Chateaubriand had spoken to Stuart, the British ambassador, in this sense in August, 1823.⁸

What measures would the French government have proposed for the pacification of the colonies had such a congress actually met? Undoubtedly the establishment of independent Bourbon monarchies in the New World. That such was the aim of France has now been definitely established. The idea occurs again and again in the correspondence of the French ministers. It is brought forward as early as 1819 by the Duc de Richelieu.⁹ It is favored in 1822 by Montmorency.¹⁰ It was the favorite dream of Chateaubriand.¹¹ It was the hope of Villèle.¹² In July of 1823 a French cabinet council had approved the project, and the French ambassador at Madrid had been instructed that such was the policy of France.¹³

As to the means by which such a policy could be effected, however, it must be admitted that the French ministers were in general far from clear. There seems to have been an optimistic belief that the colonies would welcome such an arrangement. There was the precedent of the Mexican treaty of 1821, which only the obstinacy of the Spanish Cortes prevented from forming a basis of solution in that disturbed province. Why not use a congress of the powers to urge such a settlement upon both Spain and the colonies?

That it might be necessary to use force in the establishment of independent Bourbon monarchies seems hardly to have occurred to the leaders of French policy. In the correspondence of Montmorency, Chateaubriand, and Villèle over a period of more than two years there is hardly a mention of such a thing. The French premier did, indeed, on one occasion speak of "a few ships and a little money" as desirable—and sufficient—for the enterprise.¹⁴ But barring this and two or three other similar allusions there is no evidence that the use of the French navy was ever seriously considered. There is not a sign that any offer of material aid was ever made at Madrid.

The project of independent Bourbon monarchies was not considered, indeed, as a project of aggression. It was a means of reconciling legitimacy with French commercial interest. It was dependent on the opening of the colonies to the trade of the world. It was, in

⁸ London, Public Record Office, F. O. France, vol. 293, no. 395, Aug. 18, 1823.

⁹ C. Calvo, *Anales de la Revolución de la América Latina* (Paris, 1865), V 354 ff.

¹⁰ Paris, Corr. Pol., Espagne, vol. 716, f. 27.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, vol. 722, f. 56.

¹² Villèle, *Mémoires*, IV. 200.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ Villèle, *Mémoires*, III. 188.

the language of Villèle, a project "to render more tolerable to France by the new markets open to her commerce the sacrifices which she had made and would still have to make in Spain".¹⁵

The policy of France, then, has now been made clear. But it is worth while examining it from another point of view. How far, in formulating that policy, did the French ministers take into account the United States? How far did friendship or hostility to America influence their action?

That the attitude of the United States was in any sense a major factor in French diplomacy it would be absurd to assume. The despatches of the French Foreign Office in 1823 yield a surprisingly small number of references to the American government. Far less account was taken of the attitude of this country than it might be pleasant to imagine.

So far as the United States was regarded at all, however, it was not with favor or confidence. Chateaubriand had the effrontery to tell Gallatin, the American minister at Paris, that France "would not . . . in any manner interfere in the American questions" at the very time when the scheme as to Bourbon monarchies was under discussion.¹⁶ Villèle declared jealously to Stuart that "the United States labor to counteract our measures, only for the purpose of establishing a system favorable to the democratical principles of their own government, and attaining the commercial objects of which they never lose sight".¹⁷

A more striking evidence of the attitude of the French ministers is to be found in their reception of Canning's suggestion,¹⁸ made at the time of the Polignac interview, that if a congress were held to discuss the colonial question, the American government should be invited to participate. The French ministers were horrified at such an idea. When Stuart mentioned the subject to Villèle, the French premier showed undoubted signs of irritation. "He seemed to think that the meeting had better be altogether avoided if it should be found impossible to take such a measure without the intervention of that power."¹⁹ Chateaubriand was of the same general opinion. "The United States", he wrote to Polignac, "recognized the inde-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Writings of James Monroe*, edited by S. M. Hamilton (New York, 1902), VI, 315 n.

¹⁷ London, Public Record Office, F. O. France, vol. 291, no. 285.

¹⁸ Canning then stated that "he could not understand how a European Congress could discuss Spanish American affairs without calling to their councils a power so eminently interested in the result as the United States of America". *British and Foreign State Papers, 1823-1824*, p. 49.

¹⁹ Public Record Office, F. O. France, vol. 295, no. 557, Oct. 31, 1823.

pendence of certain of the colonies a year ago. They are thus entirely disinterested, entirely outside such discussions."²⁰ When the Austrian chancellor Metternich emphatically rejected the suggestion of Canning,²¹ the French foreign minister expressed the warmest approval of his pronouncements, even going so far as to declare that the principles laid down might serve "in case of need as a supplementary article of the public law of Europe".²²

French policy, it is clear from these comments, took little account of the views of the American government. At the moment when President Monroe launched his famous manifesto, Chateaubriand and Villèle were planning a general European congress upon the colonial question, which should pave the way for the establishment of Bourbon monarchies in the New World, and from which the United States should be excluded.

But what of the attitude of the other Continental powers? It is

²⁰ Chateaubriand, *Congrès de Vérone*, II, 309-310, Nov. 6, 1823.

²¹ The language of Prince Metternich deserves quotation. "In our view the United States of America can never take part in a European congress, whatever subjects may be treated there; first, because the United States are bound by none of those diplomatic agreements which the European Alliance has discussed and adopted since 1814, and to which are referred practically all questions on account of which the powers come together in a congress; secondly, because the principal aim of these congresses, the maintenance of peace and the established order in Europe, does not concern the United States; thirdly, because in great part the principles recognized and approved by the European powers are not merely foreign but opposed to the principles of the United States, to the form of their government, to their doctrines, to their customs, to the civil and political régime of their populations. There can exist amicable relations between the powers of Europe and the United States, treaties, alliances, engagements of every sort may be negotiated with them, but no common basis exists on which the United States could take part in a European congress."

"No doubt the United States are more directly interested in the future fate of the Spanish colonies than Austria, Russia, or Prussia, but the interest of these latter powers is none the less real, and none the less worthy of respect. It would perhaps be permissible to say that it is of a more elevated nature. The interest of the United States is that of their commerce, of the increase of their territory, of the extension of their power; it is an interest purely material. That of the European powers, and of the Continental powers as of the others, is an interest in the preservation, in the stability, in the material and moral well-being of the great European family, and if they should assume to deal with the future relations of Spain with her vast American provinces, it is not to divide the spoils, or obtain any positive advantage whatsoever; it is to assure themselves that those relations will not be too far incompatible with the peace and general prosperity of Europe, and will work as little harm as possible to the rights and interests of those governments which, so to speak, created America, and have ruled over it for three centuries." (Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 20616, Nov. 26, 1823.)

²² *Ibid.*, no. 21224, Dec. 25, 1823 (encl.).

worth while to inquire just what their views portended at the time when the American manifesto was published to the world.

In November, 1823, there is, for the first time, what may fairly be called a general discussion of the colonial problem among the members of the Holy Alliance. All the allies had agreed that a congress to discuss the matter would be desirable. No step remained but the actual invitation for such a meeting, which was to come, of course, from the Spanish king.

What would be the point of view of the Austrian government in whatever assemblage might take place had for some months been abundantly clear. The clearest mind in Europe on the colonial question, it might almost be said, was Prince Metternich's. It is the fashion in these days to damn Metternich as a reactionary, but he was at least a very practical one. He had no Utopian ideas as to the reconquest of Spanish America. In July he had told Wellesley, British ambassador at Vienna, that all projects of the kind were hopeless, and that Spain would do well to confine her efforts to the preservation of Cuba.²³ Somewhat later he declared to the Russian representative that Spain should limit her efforts to the retention of the colonies which still remained faithful, and decide, at the same time, frankly to compromise with those which, on terms of mutual advantage, might consent again to become subject to her.²⁴ Finally, in November, he addressed to the Spanish government itself a long memorandum in which he urged such a policy upon it.²⁵ Platonic counsel was Metternich's sole expedient in the premises.

²³ P. R. O., F. O. Austria, vol. 178, desp. 5, July 23, 1823.

²⁴ Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 20516, Nov. 25, 1823.

²⁵ The colonies are divided into three classes. "There are some wholly under the authority of the King. There are some in which the struggle between the legitimate power and ambitious factions is not yet over. There are some which have constituted themselves independent states, and in which the struggle between the *de facto* and the *de jure* authorities has ceased. The first pre-occupation of Spain should be to assure as completely and as permanently as possible the possession of the important island of Cuba, not only by measures suitable to defend it against unjust aggression, which, happily, it is not necessary to predict, but also by a régime conformable to its present condition, and based above all on the prosperity of its inhabitants. . . . The contemplation of the present and future welfare of the faithful colony cannot fail to strengthen the legitimist party where that party is still condemned to struggle against the partisans of independence; it will serve perhaps to revive the courage of friends of the ancient order in other colonies, where attachment to the monarchy is repressed rather than destroyed." This is all that Metternich has to say with regard to the second class of colonies. With regard to those actually independent he declares, "It appears to us that all that wisdom should dictate at this time is to keep open the question of legal right. It is certainly not over this immense part of the American continent that the efforts of the mother-country can now

Of Russia it is not possible to speak so definitely. Search in both Russian and Austrian archives fails to reveal the existence of any settled policy on the part of the tsar. "Everything is in confusion in America", remarked Alexander to the French ambassador, late in November, 1823. "Let us leave this chaos for a while to reduce itself to order."²⁶ It seems tolerably certain that no positive line of action had been determined upon at this time at Petrograd.

What, then, was the actual situation at the moment when Monroe launched his famous declaration? Were Calhoun and Monroe and Madison and Jefferson justified in their apprehensions of a desperate design on colonial liberty? Not on the basis of the facts as they stood. For Austria disbelieved in the possibility of reconquest; Russia's views had not been formulated; France was seeking a compromise through the establishment of independent Bourbon monarchies in America. And, as it is hardly necessary to point out, she had already in the Polignac interview given a binding pledge against the use of force. The only measure definitely determined upon in December, 1823, was the summoning of a congress upon the colonial question.

The invitation to that congress, in the shape of a formal request for concerted action from the Spanish king, had just gone forth when the President's message reached Europe. It is important to attempt to discover just how the attitude of the powers was influenced by the American manifesto.

One point may be stated with absolute certainty. Austria and France were as determined as ever to exclude the United States from the deliberations of Europe. The Austrian chancellor hastened to assert in lofty terms his objections to American participation in a congress,²⁷ and Chateaubriand told Stuart that the President's message directed with any chance of success whatsoever. In deeming it possible to regain all, she would be practically sure to lose all." (Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 21221 (encl.).

²⁶ Paris, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Russie, vol. 165, f. 281, Nov. 28, 1823.

²⁷ Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 21224, Jan. 19, 1824. "If we have expressed an absolute veto [on the admission of the United States to a congress] our action is justified, not only on principle, but also by the rules of sound policy. The grave question which will occupy the conference is not, in the light in which it is desirable to consider it, an American question; it is, and will remain in the first period of the discussion, entirely European. In the beginning of the discussion the aim will be to prevent all the children of Europe from becoming the adults of America."

"To think of drawing the United States into the council occupied with this important inquiry, to admit even the possibility that they should intervene in it by virtue of any right whatsoever, this would be to commit a great error, to renounce the security which is still to be found in a principle even when the question of fact is no longer under one's influence."

sage "struck at the principle of mediation . . . by peremptorily deciding the question of South American independence, without listening to the concessions which either of the parties at issue might be disposed to admit", and so confirmed his resolution with regard to the United States.²⁸

But, on the other hand, both the French and the Austrian ministers hoped to use the message to persuade Great Britain to accept the invitation to the congress. Metternich declared to Wellesley that if Great Britain should decline "it would be imputed to her that she meant to follow the line taken by the United States".²⁹ "Mr. Canning", wrote Chateaubriand to Polignac, "can have no more desire than I to favor military insurrections, the sovereignty of the people, and all the beautiful things which Mr. Monroe tells us about *de facto* governments." "Point out to him that it would be a very good thing for him to accept mediation with us and the Allies."³⁰

Such was not the view of the British foreign minister. As is well known, he repudiated the idea of agreement with the United States, but he also flatly rejected the invitation to the congress. His action made a formal gathering of the powers impossible. France and Austria were wholly unwilling to participate in a congress without Great Britain. The "System of the Congresses" had come to an end.

But this does not mean that all discussion of the colonial question ceased with Canning's note of January 30. For something like five months more Spanish America still engaged the earnest attention of the diplomats of the Continental powers. There was indeed more serious discussion of actual aid to Spain in February and March of 1824 than at any other time. The President's message at any rate did not prevent such discussion.

It was Russia, whose policy, as has been seen, was still unformed in November, 1823, that was now most tenacious in the belief that some action might be taken in the colonial question. In February, 1824, Pozzo di Borgo proposed that the powers "seek, in concert with the cabinet of Madrid, the means of preparing a *Spanish* force to support the royalists of America, and examine what resources

Association with the United States is dangerous. The spirit of revolt is in their very nature. "It is the basis of their life and the first condition of their existence. It is indeed so intense that only to come into contact with it would be to expose oneself to contagion."

²⁸ P. R. O., F. O. France, vol. 305, desp. 8, January, 1824.

²⁹ P. R. O., F. O. Austria, vol. 182, no. 16, Jan. 21, 1824.

³⁰ "Lettres Inédites de Chateaubriand", in *Revue Bleue*, Nov. 2, 1912.

might be devoted to such an operation, and what difficulties lay in the way".³¹ This suggestion was rejected by the other Continental powers as "entailing concessions and sacrifices which they might not be disposed to make in favor of Spain".³² Undaunted by this rebuff the Russian minister urged the Conde de Ofalia to appeal to the members of the Alliance to begin a series of conferences at Paris on the colonial question. But again little headway was made. Chateaubriand was now more and more afraid that Great Britain intended to recognize the independence of the colonies, and that any sign of common action on the part of the Allies would precipitate such action.³³ He refused to take part in any negotiations on the subject of Spanish America,³⁴ and instructed Talaru to observe a like rule of action at Madrid.³⁵

Still the tsar and his ministers seem to have clung to the idea that some kind of aid might be accorded to Spain. Alexander gave to the French ambassador the distinct impression that he was disposed to "advise strongly the sacrifice of every other interest to theories too exclusive";³⁶ and some weeks later Nesselrode, in speaking to the French representative of the poverty and meagre resources of Spain, asked, "Why should not the Allies aid her? What could England say, or rather what could she do, if an army of Spaniards, Russians, Prussians, and Austrians embarked on a fleet lent to the King of Spain, and paid for by his allies, to re-instate him in his rights?" "This idea, extraordinary as it is," remarked La Ferronnays, "is one of a number which may have misled the Emperor, and which he would be only too disposed to follow up."³⁷

But whatever the desires of Alexander, the obstacles to the policy he played with were far too great to be overcome. Metternich, as we have seen, had never favored intervention. In a memoir of February 7, 1824, he set forth the arguments which justified his attitude. It was impossible, he wrote to Nesselrode, to act without the aid of one of the maritime powers. England was definitely opposed to armed action in the colonies; France was pledged by the interview of Polignac with Canning. Assistance to Spain would probably mean war with Great Britain. The United States had

³¹ Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 21816, Feb. 26, 1824 (encl.).

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Paris, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Esp., vol. 726, f. 358, Mar. 23, 1824.

³⁴ Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 21814, Mar. 26, 1824.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 21814, Mar. 26, 1824 (encl.).

³⁶ Paris, Corr. Pol., Russie, vol. 166, f. 81, Mar. 10, 1824.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 187, May 14, 1824.

expressed itself definitely on the South American question. All these considerations dictated a policy of inactivity.³⁸

From Chateaubriand the Russian ministers received even less encouragement than from Metternich. The French foreign secretary refused even to give assurances that France would not recognize the colonies, and he would have nothing to do with any positive plan.³⁹ Jealousy of British trade led him rather toward a friendly than a hostile policy toward Spanish America. He wrote De Serre at Naples that the acknowledgment of the independence of the new states was only a question of time.⁴⁰ "France," declared Tatistchev, "has subordinated the considerations of policy which we follow, to the counsels of mercantile cupidity."⁴¹

Russia stood, it would seem, alone in her desire for an active colonial policy. Under such circumstances, it was obvious that nothing could be done. In May, 1824, Nesselrode wrote to Pozzo, "Though the Allies, by a strict interpretation of their doctrines, might be bound not to refuse a direct assistance in men and ships to Spain, that power will readily see that so rigid a reconstruction of their engagements will serve no useful purpose while England maintains its present attitude."⁴²

The last phrase in the instructions just quoted deserves particular attention. It was England, not the United States, which occupied the mind of the Russian minister. It was fear of British opposition which led him to abandon the idea of aid to Spain. Nor was it only Nesselrode who assigned more importance to the attitude of Canning than to that of Monroe. Chateaubriand and Metternich did not abandon the idea of a congress on the colonial question with the arrival of the President's message in Europe; they even drew renewed hopes of British co-operation from the message; but their ardor for a congress cooled with the refusal of the British foreign secretary to participate. They, too, paid more heed to London than to Washington.

There is only one respect in which the message may have had a positive influence. It may have stimulated discussion of the scheme for Bourbon monarchies. Certain it is, at any rate, that such discussion is quite vigorous in the early months of 1824. Metternich now favored the project;⁴³ the Russian ambassador at Madrid took the

³⁸ Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 22337, May 8, 1824.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Congrès de Vérone*, II, 351.

⁴¹ Petrograd, F. O., Reçus no. 21874, Apr. 6, 1824.

⁴² Paris, Corr. Pol., Russie, vol. 167, f. 169, May 13, 1824.

⁴³ P. R. O., F. O. Austria, vol. 182, desp. 10, Jan. 21, 1824.

same view;⁴⁴ and Chateaubriand urged the plan with renewed vigor not only at Madrid⁴⁵ but at London.⁴⁶ The French minister, indeed, attempted to use the President's declaration to prove the immediate necessity of sending *infantes* to the New World.

But all such projects were shattered by the obstinacy of the Spanish king. His repugnance to them was "extreme and entire",⁴⁷ His assent, before they could be carried out, was of course essential.

The truth of the matter is that the Continental powers at no time in 1823 or 1824 ever had a practicable policy outlined and ready to be carried out. Nothing, indeed, but reconquest would have satisfied the Spanish king, and reconquest was never seriously considered by any power, unless perhaps by Russia. Even in the latter case, it is clear that there was never any intention to act alone.

As for the influence of the United States on the policy of the Holy Alliance, it was at all times slight. French policy was formed without consulting the wishes of the American government. France and Austria wished definitely to exclude America from any deliberation on the colonial problem, and their determination was only strengthened by the President's message. In 1824 the powers discussed the Bourbon-monarchy plan freely, and Alexander played with the idea of intervention, despite the avowed attitude of the United States. The stand taken by Monroe did not alter in any essential respect the viewpoint of the Continental powers. And, indeed, why attribute to the America of a hundred years ago the power and prestige which appertains to it among the nations of the world to-day?

DEXTER PERKINS.

⁴⁴ Petrograd, F. O., Oubril-Pozzo, Apr. 10, 1824.

⁴⁵ *Revue Bleue*, Nov. 2, 1912, p. 548. "The message ought to open the eyes of the cabinet of Madrid. Can you not show the King that it is far more desirable to place a prince of his line at the head of one of the new states, rather than to let them all escape the sovereignty of the House of Bourbon?"

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* "Mr. Canning has a clear interest in every moderate plan. Can the cabinet of London longer blind itself to the policy and desires of the American government, whose interests lead it with all its might to isolate America from Europe? . . . We believe that constitutional monarchies established in America would be a very good result, both for England and for us."

⁴⁷ Paris, Corr. Pol., Esp., vol. 726, ff. 297 and 324.

GARIBALDI'S SICILIAN CAMPAIGN AS REPORTED BY AN AMERICAN DIPLOMAT

UPON Garibaldi's Thousand a bewildering collection of volumes and pamphlets of the most varied character has been published, not a little of it good literature and of primary historical importance. But the work of the heroic expedition to Sicily was necessarily promoted by its leaders for the most part clandestinely, and was semi-shrouded in mystery; it was an epopoeia wrought in defiant derision of three-fourths of the diplomats whom it concerned, while at times it caused almost equal discomfort to the other fourth; and the diplomatic records of events have been, even to this day, largely withheld from the public eye, as not shedding excessive lustre upon diplomacy as a profession.¹

It could not be claimed that the unpublished dispatches of the American minister accredited to Turin in 1860, which we propose to examine, throw a flood of new light upon the campaign. The American representative was little more than an observer; the United States was not directly concerned in the extraordinary events related, and no possible complications of the tangled situation could require our intervention. But the dispatches do reveal some important new facts, and they are interesting for students of American diplomacy, upon the unconventional character of which they cast no discredit.

The author of the dispatches, John Moncure Daniel, of Stafford County, Virginia, had the blood of a signer of the Declaration of Independence running in his veins. He had studied law, written articles full of brilliant invective for the *Richmond Examiner*, fought several duels in consequence, and had come out to Turin in 1853, a tenderfoot diplomat, to tell the truth abroad, as he saw it, for the good of his country. His diagnosis of Italian events revealed in the earlier dispatches of his Italian mission had proved to be by no means infallible. Though Daniel always considered himself a sincere apostle of freedom, he maintained, as a fiery champion of slavery, that negroes were not to be considered men in the same

¹ This paper is based largely upon the unpublished diplomatic correspondence between John Moncure Daniel and the Secretary of State, Lewis Cass. Permission to consult the correspondence was kindly obtained for the writer by George von Lengerke Meyer when John Hay was Secretary of State.

sense as whites, and this pro-slavery taint was evidently not without influence upon his diplomatic judgment. The Virginian who in his own country advocated the secession of the Southern States could not, even though a liberal in political theory, fully sympathize with Italy's great struggles for independence and unity; his political diagnosis must often fail from want of a sympathetic understanding of the leading Italian liberals who, in the direction which they gave to events, were more logical than he.

In 1858 Daniel had been promoted from his original rank of chargé d'affaires to that of minister, but he had not enjoyed his new position long before he caused a court scandal of considerable magnitude, a scandal which is said to have led to a curious correspondence between the great Italian statesman Cavour and the Italian minister at Washington, and is more amusing for the historian than it was for Daniel. On January 24, 1859, upon the betrothal of Prince Jerome Napoleon Bonaparte, cousin of Napoleon III., to Princess Clotilde, only daughter of Victor Emmanuel II., a grand ball was given at the royal palace in Turin, and the minister of the United States received the usual official invitation. Of course he was present on the festive occasion, and furthermore he took with him, as he might perhaps properly have done at a ball in Stafford County, a lady who had not been invited, Countess Marie de Solms. The breach of etiquette was exaggerated by the fact that the French countess had been notoriously unsuccessful, even more unsuccessful than most ladies of the Second Empire, in preserving her pristine virtue or even the memory of it, and as she had been born Bonaparte Wyse and was a cousin of the emperor, Daniel might have guessed that, had her presence been desired at official Bonaparte festivities, she would have been invited.

The American minister's social position had been further disturbed by the indiscreet publication in America of a letter which he had addressed to a friend in Richmond ridiculing the habitués of the Piedmontese court—a letter which thus published had in due course found its way to Turin.²

But if Daniel, with reason, was not a great favorite in official circles, he had good outside sources of political information, and it should be noted that in the diplomatic events of 1860 the court itself was not a little bewildered—except the level-headed, liberal

² These social mishaps are naturally not recorded in Daniel's diplomatic dispatches, but they are described at some length in a memoir of Daniel written by his brother, Frederic S. Daniel, for a volume entitled *The Richmond Examiner during the War, or, The Writings of John M. Daniel* (New York, 1868).

king and his most confidential ministers and aides. Daniel thought for himself with the same independence which characterized his attendance at royal functions, and the war of 1859 had opened his eyes to the methods of Austrian absolutism and to Italy's wrongs.³ Experience of seven years enabled him to write his best dispatches in 1860—dispatches which called forth compliments from Washington; furthermore, it may be observed that when he writes to Cass with regard to translations of Italian documents which he is enclosing, he speaks of them as documents which "I have translated", a phrase which few American diplomats of any period or grade have been able or willing to use. Indeed, the history of modern diplomacy shows that it is generally considered dangerous to retain a diplomat in a country whose language he may, in an absent-minded moment and in defiance of diplomatic usage, have innocently acquired.

Garibaldi was the leading figure of 1860, and Daniel had had occasion to make his acquaintance early in the year. The general's simplicity, sincerity, and substratum of good sense made him an enigma to many diplomats, but Daniel understood him fairly well, without, however, losing his head over him. Two great national questions absorbed Garibaldi in the early spring of 1860, the proposed cession of Nice and Savoy by Piedmont to France, and a possible revolution in Southern Italy to overthrow the despotic monarchy of the Two Sicilies. The cession of Savoy and Nice had been demanded by Napoleon III. in payment of his services of 1859 in aiding Piedmont to drive the Austrians out of Lombardy, and of the resultant annexation of Central Italy. It seemed a hard bargain. Savoy was the cradle of Piedmont's royal house, and Nice was Garibaldi's beloved birthplace. But the master Italian statesman and leader, Cavour, realized that it was not the moment either to appear ungrateful or to oppose Napoleon III. The ces-

³ In a dispatch to Cass of June 28, 1859, Daniel wrote: "It is impossible not to witness with sincere pleasure the punishment of that bad power [Austria] and the defeat of the detestable system that has so long rendered wretched many millions of men. It is necessary to live near to Austria some time to know how perfectly founded in truth are all the charges which history has brought against her; to witness the cynical reliance on pure force and fraud which her political men regard as the sole motors of the world, her settled determination to oppose everything like advancement of freedom, either among individuals or communities, and especially her presumptuous arrogance and perfect confidence in her strength to defy the hatred and do without the respect and confidence of all mankind. Her vast military organization is full of this spirit; the cruelty and brutality of her soldiery is only equalled by the cold repellant pride and ill-bred swagger of her officers."

sion of Savoy and Nice meant the bitter loss of two important provinces, but it meant also that France, having been thus paid for her valuable services, could not in the future pretend to other sacrifices on the score of Italian gratitude. Furthermore, it meant that France would not find it easy to object to new and important steps that were meditated for the complete unification of oppressed Italy; already Parma, Modena, Tuscany, and the Legations had been voluntarily incorporated, together with Lombardy, in the nascent Italian kingdom under Piedmontese leadership; but other vital portions of the peninsula still remained to be won—Venice, other Roman provinces, and all of Southern Italy. Savoy and Nice must then be sacrificed that the greater Italian unification might be consummated without encountering French interference.

Cavour accepted the holocaust. Deeply moved in the Franco-Piedmontese conference of March 24, 1860, at which the treaty of cession was made, he nevertheless signed the documents with a firm hand, and then, having regained his composure, and rubbing his hands together in the way that for him always indicated satisfaction, he said laughingly in the ear of the French minister, Talleyrand: "Now we are accomplices, is it not true, Baron?"⁴ He meant accomplices in territorial readjustments which should effect the completion of Italian unity, to which he knew that Napoleon III. was in reality opposed.

But Garibaldi had not Cavour's clear understanding of the international situation and he was convinced that the cession of Nice was unnecessary. Any means, therefore, constitutional or revolutionary, calculated to prevent successfully its accomplishment he was ready and eager, as leader of the patriots of Nice, to adopt; on April 6, before the new Parliament had been constitutionally organized, he had failed in an effort to make an interpellation in the Chamber against the cession, and at about this same time he had called on Daniel at the American legation in Turin to ask whether the United States would offer protection or assistance to Nice if the little province should revolt against both France and Piedmont. This odd appeal to America is not mentioned either by Garibaldi in his *Mémoire*, or by his biographers, but Daniel reports it with some detail in his dispatch to Cass of April 10:

This parliament was deemed a body entirely devoted to the Administration of Mr. Cavour. . . . The feeble minority of dissentients which it contains were thought to be without a spokesman. It appears how-

⁴ Henry d'Ideville, *Journal d'un Diplomate en Italie* (Paris, 1872), pp. 116-117.

ever that they are to find one in this celebrated soldier, who up to this time has neither been supposed by others to be endowed with the faculty of discourse or been even conscious of such a power himself. The free remarks which he made the other day on the "sale of Nice" have, however, caused great commotion and irritation in the Ministry, and have found a deep echo in the popular heart. In passing the Place Carignan on Sunday evening, I saw many thousands of individuals assembled in front of the Parliamentary building to cheer Garibaldi as he left it.

Garibaldi is a native of Nice, strongly attached to its nationality, and bitterly opposed to Louis Napoleon and to his system; he is a naturalized citizen of the United States,⁵ and though now a member of monarchical government, does not hesitate, as he has ever done, to declare himself a republican in principle and by conviction.⁶ But though such a man, influenced by such ideas and sentiments, may make a telling speech, as he may have well led a flying column in Lombardy, yet he has not the general capacity necessary to render him a considerable statesman.

He called at my office a few days ago on an errand quite illustrative of his character. He desired to know whether the United States would give protection or assistance to Nice in case it should separate both from France and Sardinia and establish a free form of government for itself? I told him at once that the United States would interfere in no manner with such a matter; and that though I believed it to be the policy of our republic to recognize all governments that succeeded in establishing themselves and that could be regarded as responsible organizations, yet I doubted whether they would hold any intercourse, even of the most temporary character, with a mere province in rebellion against powers so much more powerful than itself as to render its immediate subjection almost a certainty. He said that he had anticipated the reply I made to his inquiry, but, in the present moment, he thought it right to leave no chance for assistance untried.

On April 12 Garibaldi finally made in Parliament his futile interpellation, in which, indeed, he himself had cherished little faith; and during these same days, acting along lines much better suited to his nature as a man of downright action, he projected a raid on

⁵ Daniel was in error in referring to Garibaldi as a naturalized citizen of the United States. On April 2, 1851, Garibaldi had obtained from Mayor Kingland of New York an American passport as one who had "declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States". But the general never took the final steps requisite to naturalization.

⁶ Garibaldi's political feeling was fundamentally sound, but his political phraseology was not conventional. Daniel's statement of the general's position was accurate; the latter often declared his platform in much the same words, as when he wrote, for example, to an English woman, Mrs. Carolina Phillipson, on Jan. 12, 1869: "The Republic is nothing more nor less than the system of government emanating from the free will of the majority; and as the condition in which you live [in England] is this, you are therefore a Republican." In "Lettere di Garibaldi a Carolina Phillipson", published in the review *L'Italia Moderna*, anno V., II. 484 (Rome, July 15, 1907).

Nice for the purpose of smashing the ballot-boxes during the elections fixed for April 15, in order to gain time for a campaign of popular persuasion against cession.⁷

In the meantime, however, the other and greater national issue that compelled Garibaldi's patriotism forged rapidly to the fore—the rousing of Southern Italy from the long bondage in which it had been held by an anti-national, despotic government. Three great revolutions, not to mention lesser attempts at insurrection, had taken place in Sicily in less than a half-century, and all had been ruthlessly suppressed by the Neapolitan Bourbons; many Sicilian patriots stoically supported chains or exile, and the bitter struggle for liberty continued; on April 4, at the very hour when Garibaldi was fuming about his native Nice, an unsuccessful revolt had been attempted in Palermo; thirteen of the insurgents were executed ten days later by the Neapolitan government. The persecutions, the cruelty, the vexations of the police of the Two Sicilies, had reached such excesses in Sicily and also on the mainland that even Gorchakov, Russian minister of foreign affairs at St. Petersburg, had protested against them as contrary to the interests of the king himself. The indomitable patriots had long looked earnestly for assistance to Piedmont, where many of their exiles had found an asylum, and all eyes now turned eagerly for leadership to Garibaldi and to his disbanded “Hunters of the Alps”, a volunteer corps which had rendered signal service in the campaign of 1859 against Austria.

Of course the Piedmontese government had no grounds for openly attacking the Neapolitan kingdom, but it had every reason to wish that a liberal government, national in feeling, might be established there. It was in a dispatch of April 21 that Daniel

⁷ An Englishman, Laurence Oliphant, who was to have participated in the ballot-box smashing, gives a lengthy account of the project and the abandonment of it, in his *Episodes in a Life of Adventure* (Edinburgh-London, 1887), pp. 165-179. Oliphant was so disappointed and so disgusted with the people of Nice at their not having resisted annexation to France, that he took revenge by casting a vote in favor of it himself. “Of course I had no right whatever to vote,” he said, “but that made no difference, provided you voted the right way. As for voting ‘No’, that was almost impossible. The ‘No’ tickets were very difficult to procure, while the ‘Yeses’ were thrust into your hands from every direction. If ever ballot-boxes deserved to be smashed and their contents scattered to the winds, these did.”

Daniel also took the view that the plebiscites, which resulted in overwhelming votes in favor of cession, were not fairly held. In his dispatch of April 17 he wrote to Cass: “Popular elections of this sort in France and Sardinia, I may be permitted to remark, are of little worth considered as true expositions of the popular will.”

brought this Piedmontese point of view to the knowledge of his chief in Washington, reporting a note which he understood that Cavour had recently addressed to the government of Naples:

He [Cavour] calls the attention of that Government to the late territorial modifications of Italy and informs it that an "Italian policy is the only one proper and salutary to any Italian State, and by such alone can the peace of Italy be secured". He declares that it is the desire of the Sardinian Government to preserve amicable relations with Naples and is ready to settle all difficulties which may give to Naples "erroneous views" of the intentions of Piedmont. But he concludes by telling the Government of Naples that these amicable sentiments can become practical things only when the cry of Italian Independence shall have the same signification in Naples and Sicily as in Piedmont and Sardinia and when the "Italian policy" shall be adopted in Messina and Gaeta.

Daniel added that although the note containing this communication from Cavour had not been published, nevertheless he believed its purport, as reported, was authentic. We have no precise knowledge of the sources of the American minister's information, but they were in this case manifestly excellent; on April 15, Victor Emmanuel II., king of Piedmont, had, indeed, upon Cavour's advice, written a letter to Francis II., king of the Two Sicilies, which began by calling the latter's attention to the change in political conditions wrought by the victories of Magenta and Solferino, and then continued:

We have thus arrived at a moment when it is possible that Italy be consolidated into two powerful states, one of the North, the other of the South; let these two, accepting the same national policy, support the great principle of the hour, *national independence*. But in order to carry out this plan, it is, I believe, essential that Your Majesty should renounce the course which you have hitherto followed. . . . Let us show to the Holy Father the necessity of granting the necessary reforms; let us unite our states in bonds of true friendship, from which will certainly follow our country's greatness. Grant a liberal constitution at once to your subjects, surround yourself with the men who are most esteemed for their sacrifices to the cause of liberty, remove every suspicion from the minds of your people.⁸

Neither Cavour nor Victor Emmanuel II. could have really expected that the liberal counsels offered in this frank and trenchant letter would be followed, but the course outlined was certainly the only possible salvation for the despotic crown of Francis II., and it was in full accord with the opinions held by the governments of England and France and with the grave counsels which their diplomatic representatives were urging upon the king at Naples. Six

⁸ Published in Chiala's preface to the fourth volume of Cavour's *Lettere* (Turin, 1885), p. cxxi.

weeks before Victor Emmanuel II. sent his letter, Elliot, British minister at Naples, had "used all the arguments in his power to persuade the [Neapolitan] Government to pause in its course", and had frankly declared to it that he "felt convinced that the destruction both of His Majesty and of the Dynasty was inevitable unless wiser counsels were listened to".⁹ The French minister, Bernier, made repeated representations of the same tenor to the Neapolitan government, informing Paris that "real evils and incontestable wrongs" were the cause of the periodic revolts in Sicily. "There is only one means of pacifying Sicily", wrote the French vice-consul at Messina, "namely to free her from the humiliating and degrading yoke of the police, a yoke which she has suffered far too long for the honor of civilized Europe." Yet such was the king's alarm over the insurrectionary movements at this time that the police were ordered to augment, not diminish, their blind ferocity, and to arrest on the unsupported evidence of spies not only those who showed sympathy with attempts at insurrection, but even those who talked about them or asked for news of them.¹⁰

The liberal institutions granted in Piedmont twelve years before and now carried into the northern and central Italian provinces just annexed, were in too striking contrast with this repressive system of the Two Sicilies for both governmental systems to be able to maintain themselves side by side in what was in reality one country. Lord John Russell pointed to the contrast between them and declared that it was neither probable nor desirable that the difference should long continue.¹¹ Cavour, similarly minded, might have said of Italy what Lincoln had said of the United States two years before: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. This country cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other." And Cavour, like Lincoln, was determined that it should become all free.

Daniel thought that the South could not liberate itself alone,¹² and he was right. But preparations for help from outside had been going on for months; indeed, the idea of an expedition of exiles and of liberals from other parts of Italy to help the Sicilian revo-

⁹ *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Naples, presented to both Houses of Parliament* (London, 1860), pp. 43-44.

¹⁰ *Documents Diplomatiques, 1860, Affaires Étrangères* (Paris, Imprimerie Impériale, 1861), pp. 128, 129, 134.

¹¹ *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Naples*, p. 44.

¹² Dispatch of May 10.

lutionists had begun to be discussed by Garibaldi in New York many years before.¹³ At this moment two important organizations of liberals recently founded in Northern Italy with the programme of consummating Italian unification, namely, the National Society, and the Committee of the Million Rifles Fund, were concentrating their attention upon Sicily; men, muskets, and money for "unknown" destination had begun to find their way to Genoa; Garibaldi was known to be visiting in a villa at Quarto, about four miles distant, and many of the men arriving were from his old corps of faithful, fearless Hunters of the Alps. Apropos of these proceedings Daniel wrote to Cass on April 21: "Unless some unforeseen circumstance arises there will be no war this year; but there will be revolutions, if it is in the power of intrigue to make them."

The Neapolitan government, in spite of its army of one hundred and thirty thousand men, and its numerous war vessels cruising night and day along the coasts of Sicily, became demoralized with fear, and shrieked its protests at Turin and at various other courts of Europe. Several times false reports that Garibaldi had sailed for Sicily threw the government of that island into a panic and raised correspondingly the morale of the revolutionists, who had a blind faith that he would come; in fact, the great leader was hesitating only because of uncertain information upon the true state of the insurrection there. On April 30, the great decision was made, and on May 10, Daniel was able to draft the most dramatic dispatch of his diplomatic career:

I have to announce the most startling and significant event that has occurred in Italy during the year. I refer to the expedition of Garibaldi to the island of Sicily. . . .

Garibaldi sailed from the Gulf of Genoa on the 5th of May 1860 with 2,200 men, with good arms and provisions, and with several pieces of cannon. . . . He chartered three large steamers belonging to a Sardinian line of boats. . . . The place of embarkation and rendezvous was Quarto, a village near the city of Genoa. The whole business was conducted without concealment or disguises. Its progress was known to every one even here in Turin. The assemblage and embarkation met with no hindrance or interference, great or small, direct or indirect, from the Sardinian authorities. . . . The men who compose Garibaldi's corps are for the most part the same who served under him in the campaign of last summer. The leaders are his old officers. . . .

The day after sailing the expedition landed for water and to complete its organization at Talamone, a little port on the confines of Tuscany and the Papal States. . . . Such arrangements having been effected, the steamers sailed again for their uncertain destination, and nothing

¹³ Tuckerman, "Garibaldi", published in the *North American Review*, XCII. 17 (Boston, January, 1861).

further has been heard of them up to the hour of writing. Intelligence has however been received from Naples, where the Government is said to be in a state of consternation. The whole Neapolitan fleet is cruising around Sicily to intercept the expedition. . . .

Daniel, though correct in his general statements, has committed here several errors of detail. The ships were two in number, not three, and they were not chartered, but seized with the connivance of the manager of the company which owned them; they were seized on the 5th, but sailed only on the 6th, early in the morning, and they carried about 1140, not 2200, volunteers. But the English minister, Hudson, quoting his consul at Genoa who had witnessed the final preparations and departure, was hardly more accurate in his dispatches to Lord Russell; he estimated the number of volunteers embarked at only 400, and he too mentions a third steamer. As to Garibaldi's "good arms and provisions . . . and cannon", it may be added that his arms were for the most part old muskets, his provisions scanty, and from Genoa or vicinity he took no cannon. These errors are of interest as indicating that, in fact, much secrecy had been observed by the Garibaldian leaders in their preparations, although every one knew, "even in Turin", that *something* was being prepared.

In this same dispatch Daniel continued:

Here in Turin the Government takes no pains to contradict the general belief of its participation in this strange movement. . . . Apart from the private sources which enable me to say with almost absolute confidence that this expedition has been gotten up under the patronage and with the assistance of the Sardinian Government, the mere facts that . . . arms, soldiers and cannon were embarked almost on the outskirts of Genoa itself, and that this whole armament sailed peaceably out of the Gulf of Genoa, where Sardinia keeps a large fleet, a great garrison, a watchful police, and whose cliffs bristle with forts and artillery—these public facts render it impossible even for the passing observer to doubt for a moment that this is the act of the Sardinian Government itself. In a movement organized on so vast a scale it would have been impossible to have taken even a single step without the full knowledge and authority of the powers at Turin. This is *undeclared war* of Sardinia against Naples. It does not suit the convenience of the Government here to avow that they undertake hostilities against the king of the Two Sicilies to drive him away, abolish the separate existence of that country, and to unite his territory to their own. They have no tangible ground for a Declaration of War. Hence they pursue their object under the name of Garibaldi.

In private and unofficial conversations it is argued that unless this expedition had been permitted they would have been engaged in conflict with the Pope and the king of Naples at Bologna. The re-organization of the Papal army, the concentration of troops at Gubbio, and the

evident concert of the king of Naples with Lamoricière, give colour to this view. Hence the friends of the Government think that it was both justifiable and adroit to strike the first blow and disconcert the plan of the enemy by an insurrectionary assault on his own home.

In dispatch No. 145 I stated what seemed to me the present policy of the ultra Italian party. . . . Deserted by France, they have no idea of carrying on the struggle with Austria on the present footing. At the same time there can be no peace till Venice is wrested from the hands of that power. Hence it behooves them to unite the entire peninsula to the south of the Po under one head, and they can only effect this object by revolutionizing the kingdom of Naples, expelling the Bourbon dynasty, and then by procuring a popular vote for annexation to Piedmont, as they have already done in Parma, Modena, Tuscany and in the Legations. All their energies and intrigues have for some time past been directed to these results. A revolution in Naples and the consolidation of that country in the Subalpine kingdom before the end of this year is a matter of life or death to the Italian party. . . .

The countenance given to these measures by the English Minister in Turin, amounting almost to participation in them, is to me very surprising. That he could or would have done so without the direction of his superiors at London is impossible. . . .

It only remains to give my own opinion as to the probabilities of Garibaldi's success. . . . The greatest danger which Garibaldi has to run is in the passage by sea. Naples has a considerable number of vessels of war. Garibaldi's steamers could stand no chance if they came in reach of them, and, though a vessel of passage can outstrip most ships of war in a race of speed, they might be so headed and surrounded by a fleet that they would have to risk the cannon shot, and a few broadsides would end the affair by sinking the whole expedition in the sea. On the other hand I am confident that in the last emergency the English or Sardinian squadrons cruising over the same ground would interfere in some way to the advantage of the expedition. The chances that it escapes the dangers of the voyage are equal. But should Garibaldi effect a landing, I have no doubt at all as to his success. Should he fairly land, the days of the Bourbon Dynasty at Naples are numbered and the separate existence of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies will soon have place in history alone.

These concluding paragraphs offered as daring and fortunate a prophecy as it often falls to the lot of a diplomat to make: unquestionable success of the Garibaldian arms, once they were landed, not only in Sicily, but also in the Neapolitan provinces; speedy expulsion of the Bourbon dynasty from Italy, neck and crop; and an immediate plebiscite for total annexation of the Two Sicilies to the kingdom of Victor Emmanuel II.

The fulfilment of the prophecy was to prove complete, to the letter. Garibaldi's progress from the day of his landing turned out, indeed, to be one unbroken series of military successes alike in Sicily and on the Neapolitan mainland; the great plebiscite, an over-

whelming vote in favor of annexation, was held on October 21; and consolidation of the Two Sicilies in the Italian state was definitely proclaimed by royal decree on December 17, as Daniel had said, "before the end of the year".

But this extraordinary outcome of the hazardous expedition was, on May 10, quite other than a foregone conclusion. The difficulties to be overcome, military and diplomatic, were well-nigh insurmountable; both of the great leaders, Garibaldi and Cavour, foresaw them and hesitated long before the final cast of the dice was made. One factor, and one alone, made for success: the burning, unquenchable, irresistible desire of the Italian people, from Sicily to the Alps, for freedom from foreign domination, for political liberty, and for peace through national unity. And, as Daniel wrote, "There could be no peace till Venice was wrested from the hands of Austria", and unification of the entire peninsula was achieved. The men from the north of Italy who largely composed the Thousand gladly offered their lives in Garibaldi's campaign, not merely to free their southern brothers from despotic government, but because they saw in this liberation the unification of Italy; patriots of the Veneto and the Trentino firmly believed that battles heroically won in the overthrow of the despotic Neapolitan government were in reality victories also in the great struggle for the expulsion of hated Austria from Venice and Trent. It was the consuming passion of Italian unification that was carrying all before it, and it was because Daniel, though secessionist in his own country, now saw the inevitable necessity for unity in Italy, that he was able to forecast events so truly.

It appears to me clear [he wrote in another dispatch] that one of those great movements of nations and races which have from time to time altered the political condition and relative proportions of European States is now on foot in this peninsula. What passes here is not the work of individuals, of factions, or even of parties. It is the general sentiment and unanimous volition of nearly all the inhabitants of Italy. There is an universal determination of all its people—Romans, Tuscans, Neapolitans, and Lombards—to do away with their former system of divided government and to unite in one body. When twenty millions of people, having already some general bonds and means of union at their command, become possessed of an idea and wish so general and deeply seated as that which now prevails here it is quite impossible to resist or thwart them. A nation under such circumstances accomplishes its destiny with the force and certainty of the elements, blind to consequences and deaf to both menace and persuasion. The Emperor of France during the last winter did use all the means that statecraft could devise to stem or turn the general current of affairs

in Italy; but he had not more success than king Canute when he commanded the tide of the German ocean to rest at low water.¹⁴

As Daniel stated, at the date of his dispatch of May 10, Cavour had made no effort to deny the charges of complicity, on the part of the Piedmontese government, in Garibaldi's expedition.¹⁵ We now know that Cavour privately admitted such complicity; indeed, on the same day that Daniel wrote, he declared that "circumstances had induced the government to oppose no effective obstacles to the expedition".¹⁶ A tempest of diplomatic protest, particularly from Russia, Prussia, Austria, and France, had since May 6 beaten heavily upon Cavour's head; but France, probably on account of the impending parliamentary ratification at Turin of the cession of Nice and Savoy, had shown less displeasure than he expected, and on May 17 he wrote privately to Colonel Cugia in Bologna, "Garibaldi's expedition was openly favored by England and mildly opposed by France".¹⁷ With regard to British complicity, then, Daniel was also right. And if England could openly favor Garibaldi, Piedmont, an *Italian* liberal power, could *a fortiori* justify herself for doing so.

On May 7, Garibaldi's steamers had put in at Talamone, a small port on the almost deserted coast of the Tuscan *maremma*, where they took on ammunition, water, and provisions;¹⁸ two days later at Porto San Stefano, a few miles farther south, they took on coal, and then stood out to sea, avoiding the ordinary steamer routes and laying their course for the northwestern corner of Sicily. As Colonel Nino Bixio, "the second of the Thousand", commanding one of the steamers, emphatically declared, they had been extremely lucky at Porto San Stefano, having obtained coal in abundance, "enough to carry them to Sicily, and if necessary to Hell".¹⁹ He was convinced that it would not now take them long to reach one destination or the other.

¹⁴ Dispatch of June 12.

¹⁵ *L'Opinione*, Cavour's foremost newspaper, refrained, undoubtedly by government order, from any mention of the expedition until May 10.

¹⁶ Letter to Vice-Admiral Francesco Serra. Cavour, *Lettere*, VI, 560.

¹⁷ B. Ricasoli, *Lettere e Documenti* (Florence, 1890), V, 82; Cavour, *Lettere*, III, 251.

¹⁸ Unpublished documents containing a few new details of interest regarding the landing at Talamone are given by Michel, "I Mille nelle Acque dell' Argentario", in the historical review *Il Risorgimento Italiano*, III, 1004-1009 (Turin, December, 1910).

¹⁹ Ippolito Nievo, "Da Quarto a Palermo", an important diary of one of the Thousand published in the review *La Lettura* (Milan, May, 1910), p. 386. This diary has not been used by the principal historians of the expedition.

The fortunate landing of the expedition at Marsala on the western point of Sicily on May 11, under the very guns of Neapolitan men-of-war, was reported by Daniel in his dispatches of May 15 and June 4, but of Garibaldi's brilliant victory against overwhelming odds at Calatafimi, his arduous march upon Palermo, and the almost miraculous storming of the Sicilian capital on May 27, no details were given. The negotiations, however, between Garibaldi and the representatives of the Neapolitan government for the capitulation of Palermo were described with caustic observations upon the weakness and demoralization of the Neapolitans.

The rapidity and completeness of Garibaldi's success, and the fact that thousands of Sicilian patriots had rallied to his banner on the march upon Palermo, so strengthened the position of Italian nationalists before the world that operations in northern Italy to reinforce the movement in its triumphant progress could now be carried on more openly,²⁰ and early in June events transpired which gave a more direct interest to Daniel's dispatches as they arrived in Washington—namely, events in which the complicity of American citizens and of at least one American official figured unequivocally.

In the outfitting of the Thousand, American collaboration had not been entirely lacking; the financial report of the Million Rifles Fund gives as its first item the receipt of 6850 lire transmitted from New York directly to the hands of Garibaldi on the eve of his departure from Genoa. In the course of the Sicilian and Neapolitan campaigns numerous other cash contributions were received by the Million Rifles Fund from various parts of the United States, from New Orleans to San Francisco and Portland, Oregon; the total contributions from New York City alone equalled those from all England. The greater number of American subscribers were of Italian origin; Italians in America had then, as they have to-day, deep and loyal interest in events in their mother country, as well as in those of their country of adoption; but the lists contained the

²⁰ Diplomatic opposition, however, had by no means ceased. Cavour's position was well defined in a statement made by Napoleon III. to Nigra, Piedmontese minister in Paris, and reported by the latter to Cavour in a remarkable letter of July 13: "Now you have against you nearly all of the cabinets. Lord John Russell is not very keen for the annexation of Sicily (he read me a dispatch from Berlin in this sense); Mr. de Schleinitz proposes collective representations to Piedmont to assure the integrity of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; Prince Gorchakov accuses me of favoring the revolution and declares that Russia will never be found in the revolutionary camp; he proposes a naval intervention in favor of the King of Naples, and he announces formally that Russia will never permit the annexation of Sicily to Piedmont." The letter was first published in the historical review *Il Risorgimento Italiano*, IX. 277-281 (Turin, 1916).

names of many who could lay no claim to Italian blood—names such as Smith, Webster, and Brown.²¹ Colonel Samuel Colt of Hartford, Connecticut, gave one hundred revolvers and revolver-carbines, which arrived in time to arm as many men of what is generally known as the second expedition, which sailed from Genoa on the night of June 9-10, under the American flag. The Colt revolver-carbines, which could fire five shots without being re-loaded, proved, it has been said, a determining factor in the repulse of the Neapolitan cavalry in Garibaldi's hard-won victory of Milazzo²² on July 20. The second expedition in reinforcement of Garibaldi, commanded by the general's oldest and most trusted lieutenant, Colonel Giacomo Medici, consisted of from 2200 to 2400 men, transported on three steamers, the *Washington*, the *Franklin*, and the *Oregon*. On the night preceding, a vanguard of the expedition comprising from 900 to 1000 men had left Genoa on the American clipper *Charles and Jane* in tow of the little Piedmontese steamer *Utile*, the force being under the command of Major Clemente Corte. The *Utile* and the clipper were captured by a Neapolitan warship and taken in triumph to Gaeta, but Medici with the other vessels reached Castellamare, Sicily, in safety on June 17, via Cagliari. Daniel reported events to Cass as follows:

The telegraph this morning [June 19] brings the statement that an *American clipper*, towed by a small steam vessel, laden with troops and arms for Garibaldi and bound for Sicily, has been captured by Neapolitan vessels of war.

I have also lately learned that three French passenger steam-boats, old and in bad condition, have been purchased by, or at least in the name of, a person at Genoa who claims the title of an American citizen. These vessels then hoisted the American flag and, having been severally christened the *Washington*, the *Franklin* and *Oregon*, got up steam and left Genoa without cargo. It is supposed that they are engaged in the affairs of Sicily.

I have this morning addressed notes to the Consulates of Genoa, Spezia and Leghorn, requesting further information relative to these vessels. . . .

That more of Garibaldi's vessels have not been captured, indeed that all of them have not been captured, is a striking proof of the weakness which pervades the whole organization of the Neapolitan Government. It possesses a large and expensive fleet, which cruises around Sicily, yet this is the first thing that they have done. On the other hand the

²¹ Enrico Bessana and Giuseppe Finzi, *Reso-conto di tutta la Gestione del Fondo del Milione Fucili* (Milan, February, 1861).

²² The only known revolver-carbine of this lot that has been preserved is in the possession of the well-known Risorgimento scholar in Milan, Comm. Ambrogio Crippa, whose father used it with deadly effect at Milazzo.

publicity with which the various reinforcements²³ are sent to Garibaldi is complete. Days before the vessels set out, their proposed departure, the force that they will convey, and even the hour of their leaving Genoa or Leghorn is known to everyone here and sometimes announced in the newspapers. When the appointed hour arrives, and the vessels are loaded, the men assemble in the most frequented parts of those cities, the expedition sails with the regularity of a packet-boat, and some days after, their safe arrival at a Sicilian port is chronicled by the telegraph as if it were part of the regular business of the world.²⁴

In soliciting information regarding the departure of the three steamers of Medici's expedition, "bearing the American flag", and reported "to be engaged in the movements of General Garibaldi between Sicily and Naples", Daniel wrote to W. L. Patterson, American consul at Genoa: "While I have neither the right nor the disposition to interfere with these affairs, it is proper that this Legation should be informed, so far as possible, of the truth of this report."

This gratuitous protestation by Daniel that he had "no disposition to interfere", is not without interest, particularly when taken in connection with an inadvertent admission to Cass that he, Daniel, had held a conversation with Garibaldi regarding affairs in the Two Sicilies "a short time previously to his departure".²⁵ That Patterson did not need this suggestion will be seen from his reply:

On the 8th inst. Mr. Finzi and Mr. William De Rohan a citizen of the U. S. from Philadelphia appeared at this Consulate and before me concluded and signed the contract of purchase on the part of Mr. De Rohan of three steamers, the *Washington* 469.59 tons, the *Oregon* 126.99 tons and the *Franklin* 233 tons. The money was paid by Mr. De Rohan and a formal delivery of the vessels was made into his hands. Of the

²³ In the preparation of the Medici expedition the Piedmontese government even ordered a special train which collected the Garibaldian volunteers at different stations and took them to Genoa. Cadolini, "Garibaldi nel 1860", published in *La Nuova Rivista di Fanteria* (Rome, May 15, 1910), p. 411.

²⁴ The first expedition of reinforcements was one to which due importance has never been given by historians. As La Farina declared on May 17, Garibaldi's most urgent need in Sicily was of arms and ammunition. Accordingly, on May 25, under command of Major Carmine Agnetta, an expedition of sixty volunteers in charge of 3000 muskets and 100,000 cartridges left Genoa on board the *Utile*, which was little more than a tugboat. For evidence of assistance from the Piedmontese government in the preparation of this expedition, consult H. Nelson Gay, "Garibaldi und die Tausend", published in the *Deutsche Revue* (Stuttgart, December, 1910). The *Utile* landed men and cargo safely at Marsala on June 2.

²⁵ Dispatch of June 19, in which Daniel says that Garibaldi had declared to him, apropos of possible unreadiness of the Neapolitans to throw off their despotic government, that "Liberty itself must sometimes be forced on the people for their future good".

Washington Mr. De Rohan took command himself, and he appointed to the commands of the others Mr. J. W. Nevins a native of the U. S. and Mr. Or[ri]goni a naturalized citizen of the U. S.

It was my private opinion that the purchaser of these vessels intended to employ them in the transportation of men and munitions from this [port] to Sicily. At least rumor said so. But inasmuch as the conditions of the law were complied with and the contract of sale and purchase a valid one, I could not allow my private opinion as to the ultimate destination of these vessels to interfere to prevent my official confirmation of the purchase. Nor had I the right to refuse.

These vessels cleared from this port on the evening of the 9th inst. for Athens, Greece, bearing I am told the American flag, which their ownership and papers authorized them to wear. I am likewise credibly informed that after leaving this port they put into Cornegliano a short distance from this city on the western coast and took on board men and munitions of war. These vessels were, or at least two of them, the *Washington* and the *Oregon*, at Cagliari on the 11th inst. I have heard nothing of them since.

It is amusing to read Patterson's statement that he had been "told" that the vessels had sailed under the American flag. The exact truth was that on the afternoon of June 9, in company with De Rohan, he had been rowed out to the *Washington* as she was about to leave the harbor of Genoa, had spent several hours on board while she was taking on arms, uniforms, and stores, and before going ashore had hoisted the American flag on her himself.²⁶ Mr. J. West Nevins, who figured as the commander of the *Oregon*, was a friend and secretary of Patterson and took part in the expedition at his own expense and risk. As Felice Orrigoni wrote to Garibaldi from the deck of the *Franklin* in Sicilian waters on June 17: "The American consul in Genoa, Mr. L. Patterson, did everything that he could for us, at the risk of losing his position."²⁷ There is no question but that he and Commodore William De Rohan were as loyal and enthusiastic Garibaldians as any of the Italian patriots who were ready to risk their lives and their position that Italy might be free and united.

De Rohan was a *bona fide* sea-captain, an old friend and admirer of Garibaldi, whom he had first met at Montevideo in the forties and to whom he had presented a sword at Gibraltar in 1850, when the defeated and proscribed hero was on his way to exile in the United States. Just how the American now came to participate in

²⁶ Testimony of Colonel Peard, an English member of the expedition, who was in the rowboat which took De Rohan and Patterson out to the *Washington*. Peard's Diary, published in the *Cornhill Magazine* (London, June, 1908), p. 813.

²⁷ G. E. Curatulo, *Garibaldi, Vittorio Emanuele, Cavour* (Bologna, 1911), p. 185.

Garibaldi's great Sicilian undertaking is not known. The first record that we have of his presence in Italy at this time is a letter which he addressed to King Victor Emmanuel on May 28. He was devoted to the Italian cause, and for the services which he rendered in this second expedition and in the subsequent development of events he might quite properly be called "Garibaldi's American", as Colonel Peard who went out with him on the *Washington* was known as "Garibaldi's Englishman". De Rohan impressed the Italian patriots as a man of action and, generally speaking, of sound judgment.²⁸ The three vessels had been purchased in Marseilles for 752,480.55 lire by Finzi of the Million Rifles Fund, and had been made over to De Rohan with a regular bill of sale in Patterson's consular office, in order that they might sail under the protection of the American flag, being American property, commanded by American citizens and in part manned by American sailors. On June 8, however, De Rohan signed a declaration for Finzi to the effect that although the American was figuring in the ships' papers as owner of the three vessels *Amsterdam*, *Helvétie*, and *Belgiennne*, which had been rechristened *Franklin*, *Washington*, and *Oregon*, Finzi was in reality the owner. De Rohan promised to transfer the ships back to Finzi's name immediately upon the latter's request.²⁹ The Italian patriots certainly took a chance with De Rohan, notwithstanding this written declaration, but the American proved more than worthy of their confidence.

If only a straw owner of the ships, De Rohan was by no means a mere figurehead as commander of the *Washington*; his whole heart was in the expedition and he bore a prominent and gallant part in the guidance of his little fleet of three American ships through the perils and difficulties of their voyage, exhibiting true Garibaldian energy and daring, and earning the esteem and gratitude of his volunteers and their chiefs.

At Cagliari, their port of call, the Piedmontese governor made some difficulties about allowing the *Washington* and her sister ships to proceed, so De Rohan went on shore to call on His Excellency. Peard tells the story:

At first there seemed some hesitation about his being admitted, but the American was not to be done. He walked in and insisted on the great man being sent for. After some few words he said, "Are you an Italian in heart or only in name?" and then, advancing towards him

²⁸ Curatulo, *ibid.*; Michele Amari, *Carteggio* (Turin, 1896), II. 96.

²⁹ A. Luzio, "Le Spedizioni Medici-Cosenz", published in the review *La Lettura* (Milan, June, 1910), p. 485.

and pointing to a couple of decorations he wore, added, "Those decorations you wear have been given you by your country; will you now in return betray her interests and disgrace those ribbons you have received from her?" The Governor jumped off his feet as if he feared he was going to be eaten, but, when he found De Rohan had no such cannibal intention, recovered himself, and at length gave his word she should leave as soon as her steam was up, and he kept his promise.³⁰

The most dangerous hours of the voyage were now at hand with the approach to the shores of Sicily, and De Rohan was determined to leave untried no means that could contribute to the safe conduct of the expedition. A letter was accordingly dispatched, addressed by him to Captain Palmer of the *Iroquois*, an American war-ship then stationed in the harbor of Palermo for the protection of American interests. De Rohan informed the captain of the *Iroquois* of the route that he was taking but did not state the cargo that he was carrying; he hoped that Palmer would cruise off the coast and meet him, and if occasion should require, protect the American flag. By the same post Medici wrote to Garibaldi suggesting that he use his good offices with Palmer to further the realization of De Rohan's hope.³¹

But need for this assistance was eventually removed, for the Piedmontese admiral commanding in these waters had made up his mind that De Rohan's vessels should be safely escorted for the remainder of their voyage by one or more Piedmontese war-ships; thus protected, the *Washington* on the evening of June 17 sailed into the port of Castellamare, the *Franklin* and *Oregon* considerably astern.³² Nearly 2500 men, about 8000 rifles and muskets, and an enormous number of cartridges were thus safely landed, and the completion of Garibaldi's great task in Sicily was assured.³³

What Captain Palmer would have done, if the escort had not

³⁰ Peard's Diary, p. 815. The reason for the hesitation of Comm. A. Mathieu, governor of the province of Cagliari, to allow the *Washington* to proceed was undoubtedly Cavour's telegraphic order, received for transmission to Admiral Persano, for the arrest of Mazzini, who was erroneously reported to be on the ship. C. di Persano, *Diario* (Turin, 1880), pp. 36-37.

³¹ Curàtulo, *Garibaldi, Vittorio Emanuele, Cavour*, p. 180. In a letter written on board the *Washington* and published in the *Illustrated London News* of July 7, 1860, p. 19, one of the volunteers declared: "I am not at liberty to tell you how much we owe Captain De Rohan for his exertions in this expedition."

³² Persano, *Diario*, p. 45; Peard's Diary, pp. 815-816.

³³ As Luzio says, had it not been for this Medici expedition and that of Cosenz which De Rohan took out on the *Washington* and *Provence* from Genoa on his second trip on July 2, Garibaldi's heroic taking of Palermo would have been in vain, or at best Sicily alone would have been redeemed from Bourbon despotism. Luzio, *Le Spedizioni Medici-Cosenz*, p. 481.

been provided by the Piedmontese navy, it would be useless to surmise, but we know what he had already done for Garibaldi some two weeks before when the general was almost in despair over lack of ammunition. The incident is described by an Englishman who had the story from Palmer's own lips a few months later. The American captain had been present by request on May 30 at the negotiations for an armistice carried on between Garibaldi and the Neapolitan general Letizia on board the English man-of-war *Hannibal* in Palermo harbor. When the turbulent discussion over the conditions of the agreement had terminated,

Garibaldi sauntered up to Palmer in as unsuspecting a manner as possible, while Mundy happened to be speaking a word or two to the Neapolitan, and whispered in his ear, "Can't you let me have a little powder?" But this would have compromised the neutrality of the United States, and Captain Palmer therefore replied, "I'm sorry I can't; but I think I can tell you of a friend of mine who can", at the same time indicating with his finger an American merchantman that chanced to be in the harbor. Garibaldi took the hint, went to the vessel, and obtained what he wanted. Later he confessed that, at the time he was threatening to go on fighting the overwhelming force of his enemies, he had scarcely a cartridge left.³⁴

From what source the American merchantman obtained the powder is not stated.

The American clipper *Charles and Jane* was a part of Medici's expedition and should have joined De Rohan's merchant fleet at Cagliari. Her capture by the Neapolitans was naturally a matter of grave concern to Patterson, who answered Daniel's request for information with the following second dispatch of June 20:

On the evening of the 8th inst. an American ship the *Charles and Jane*, Samuel Donnel master, cleared and left this port under the following circumstances:—

Capt. Donnel having discharged his cargo from New Orleans and being unchartered for a cargo home was about proceeding to Trapani on the western end of Sicily to purchase a cargo of salt on account of his owners. On the 7th inst. the day before he sailed he called upon me and stated that a proposition had been made to him by certain parties offering him a very remunerating sum of money to take men and munitions of war to Cagliari in the island of Sardinia; he wished to know of me if he would run any risk in taking such freight. I told him he had a perfect right without fear of molestation to take any cargo from this port to Cagliari that the authorities of the place, being ports within the same kingdom, allowed him to depart with. But that

³⁴ A. S. Bicknell, *In the Track of the Garibaldians* (London, 1861), p. 236. Persano wrote in his *Diario*, p. 13, under date of Palermo, June 8: "The English admiral and the American commander, Mr. Palmer, are the ones who have shown me the greatest sympathy for the Italian cause."

a cargo contraband of war for Sicily would endanger his vessel. He told me that the freight was for Cagliari, and, having closed with the terms of the proposers, he cleared as I have stated on the evening of the 8th "for Trapani touching at Cagliari" where his cargo was to be delivered.

The Captain having unsettled business with his consignees here could not leave with his ship but departed the day after to Cagliari, where he expected to find her. I received a letter from him dated from that place on the 11th inst.; his ship had not arrived and he was awaiting her with some anxiety.

On yesterday Capt. De Negri, in the Sardinian mercantile marine, deposed before me that on the 10th inst. whilst proceeding to Genoa off the island of Elba he saw a small steamer with a ship in tow taken possession of by a large steamer which he recognized as a Neapolitan and which with the prizes proceeded in the direction of Naples.

Now as the *Charles and Jane* which left the harbor on the evening of the 8th did not go to sea until the morning of the 9th and as she was in tow of a small tug steamer and as from the distance and direction with the winds then prevailing the *Charles and Jane* should have been at that time off Elba in her course to Cagliari I infer she was the vessel captured by the Neapolitan. From the facts I have stated and the place of capture you will see at once that the capture was unlawful. I have written to our Minister at Naples and placed him in possession of these facts, of which in this note I have the honor to inform you. . . .

P.S. Since writing the foregoing Capt. Donnel has arrived from Cagliari in search of his vessel. There is a rumor that the vessel has been demanded by our Minister at Naples supported by the Representatives of the other powers—nothing is known of the result as yet.

P.S. I have this instant received telegraphic dispatch from the Hon. J. R. Chandler saying that the *Charles and Jane* was captured and now at Gaeta. He had applied to the Government.

Immediately upon receipt of Patterson's dispatch regarding the *Charles and Jane* Daniel addressed a note to the Piedmontese minister of foreign affairs requesting official information upon the capture.³⁵ Cavour replied as follows:

TURIN, le 23 Juin 1860.

Monsieur le Ministre,

Je m'empresse de répondre à la Note que vous avez bien voulu m'adresser pour me demander des renseignements sur la capture de deux bâtiments dont l'un Sarde l'autre Américain par une Frégate Napolitaine.

Les informations que le Gouv. a reçu de ses Agens à Naples confirment que ce fait s'est passé en haute mer, à quinze milles du Cap Corso. Le petit vapeur Sarde *Utile* remorquait de Gênes à Cagliari le navire Américain *Charles and Jane* qui était chargé de passagers.

Le Frégate Napolitaine *Fulminante* qui rencontra ces deux bâtiments, après avoir reconnu leur nationalité respective, les força par deux coups de canon à la suivre à Gaète où équipages et navires sont tenus sous les feux de la Forteresse et gardés par des factionnaires Napolitains.

³⁵ Note of June 22.

A la demande du Marquis de Villamarina qui n'a été informé de ce fait que fort tard (car on a refusé de lui transmettre un télégramme que le Déléгат Consulaire Sarde à Gaète lui avait expédié à cet effet) les Capitaines des deux navires dont il s'agit ont été conduits à Naples, où l'on permit aux Ministres Américain et Sarde de les visiter à bord de la Frégate Napolitaine *Archimède*.

Après avoir entendu les explications du Capitaine du vapeur Sarde *Utile*, le Marquis de Villamarina a déclaré que la capture de ce bâtiment était nulle et illégale. Je n'ai pas le moindre doute que de son côté le Gouvernement des Etats Unis, qui a tant d'intérêt à maintenir la liberté des mers et qui a toujours défendu avec une infatigable énergie les droits de la navigation, prendra aussi les mesures nécessaires pour faire respecter son pavillon.

J'ajouterai que l'Agent Consulaire Sarde à Gaète a offert ses services et des secours pécuniaires au Capitaine et aux passagers du Clipper Américain capturé, qui l'ont remercié en assurant n'avoir besoin de rien.

Agréez, Monsieur le Ministre, les assurances de ma considération très distinguée.

C. CAVOUR.³⁶

A Monsieur Daniel,
Ministre des Etats Unis d'Amérique à Turin.

In a dispatch of June 26, Daniel reported to Cass the contents of these letters of Patterson and Cavour, and added:

The American Minister at Naples has demanded the release of the [American] vessel and cargo. . . . The Sardinian Government considers the capture of both vessels void and illegal on account of the scene of their taking and the port of their destination. Hence the Sardinian Minister at Naples has demanded the release of the Sardinian steamer and acts in concert with the Minister of the United States. . . . Your Minister in Naples will doubtlessly [*sic*] furnish full details of what passes there.

The Neapolitan authorities thought that the American flag was probably being fraudulently carried by De Rohan's ships and by the *Charles and Jane*,³⁷ and immediately upon the arrival of the latter at Gaeta a Neapolitan naval officer boarded her and demanded of first officer J. W. Watson, acting captain, the consignment of the ship's papers. Watson is reported to have replied in substance as follows: "I refuse to consign my papers to pirates, who seize and cannonade without showing their own colors and who have insulted the American flag. I will cede only to force, and if I am compelled to cede, my government has a sufficient number of war-ships to re-

³⁶ Hitherto unpublished, as also the other diplomatic documents given in this study.

³⁷ On June 22, Ippolito Garron, Neapolitan consul in Genoa, wrote to Patterson to ask whether he had authorized these ships to fly the American flag. Patterson replied under the same date that all of these ships had the right to fly the American flag as they were the property of American citizens.

duce the whole Kingdom of Naples to ashes. In short, I will consign my papers to my own consul only." The Neapolitan went away and soon afterward a higher official appeared accompanied by a man who represented himself to be the American consul, but again Watson refused to show his papers because the so-called consul could not prove himself to be such. "The conduct of Captain Watson in this affair", wrote a Garibaldian on the ship, "is above all praise. The American government knows how to command respect, and in this lies all our hope."³⁸

Six days later Watson, still a prisoner, was taken to Naples on board the Neapolitan war-ship *Archimede*, that he might confer with the American minister, Joseph R. Chandler, who had been doing everything in his power, but with indifferent success, to obtain authentic information regarding the capture. Chandler looked upon the incident as presumably a grave breach of international law, and was working on it in close touch with the Sardinian minister, Villamarina; upon receipt of the first news he had summoned Captain Palmer to come over at once from Palermo, if possible, with the *Iroquois*, and he was now on the point of dispatching an American diplomatic attaché to Gaeta. He was acting with dignity and circumspection, and also with firmness; while the Neapolitan government, finding itself in an embarrassing position, proved courteous. Chandler discovered that the papers of the *Charles and Jane* now brought to him by Watson were not altogether regular; in fact Watson admitted that their irregularity had led him to delay in appealing to the American legation at Naples. The papers contained no clearance for Cagliari and failed to state that mate Watson had been charged with temporary command. It seemed discreet to the American minister, therefore, to leave the papers in Watson's hands. Their irregularity had no bearing upon the Neapolitan violation of the freedom of the seas in visiting the ship and in interfering with her voyage, and it was on the ground of this violation that Chandler, on June 18, decided to address a formal protest to Carafa, acting Neapolitan minister of foreign affairs:

After conversation with Watson upon the subject of his capture, and the condition of the crew of his vessel, the undersigned requested

³⁸ Mario Menghini, *La Spedizione Garibaldina*, pp. 334-340. Angela Ottolini, "Voluntari Garibaldini Catturati dai Borboni", published in the *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento*, V. 316-321 (Rome, April-June, 1918). The Garibaldians were evidently still uncertain as to the extent to which they would be supported by the Piedmontese government.

to see the "Papers" of the captured ship; these were promptly exhibited.

The "Register" showed that the captured ship was called the *Charles and Jane*, and that she was built and owned in the town, or city, of Bath in the state of Maine, in the United States of America. The Register was perfect.

The "Role d'équipage" showed that the crew was, with the exception of two men, composed entirely of citizens of the United States: a proportion of citizens much larger than is usually found on board of American vessels. . . . Watson, being asked in what latitude and longitude he was when captured, stated that "he had not taken the latitude" but the record on the "log book" of the ship shews that she was captured in making a voyage from one port to another in the Kingdom of Sardinia and while distant fifteen (15) miles North East from Cap Corse, the northern extremity of the Island of Corsica.

The place in which the ship was captured was then on the High Seas, the Great Common Way of Nations. It was far distant from the coast of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, north even of the most northern boundary of the Papal States, on the Mediterranean side, and in that situation, being of a nation in peace and amity with the King of the Two Sicilies, and departing from, and going to, a port of a nation (Sardinia) at peace also with His Sicilian Majesty, it follows of course that the ship *Charles and Jane* was, not only not liable to capture, but was by the laws of nations exempt from even visitation.

It follows then that the Commander of the Neapolitan cruiser had no right to arrest the progress of the ship—had no right to board her, had no right to divert her from her course, to take her as a prize into Gaeta or any other port. And hence not only is such an arrest of progress, such a boarding and such diversion and capture an unlawful injury to the owners of the ship, but the boarding itself even without the other wrongs is an affront to the flag of the United States, for which it is the duty of the undersigned to seek redress.

In the situation of the case, the undersigned can have no doubt that His Excellency the Commander Carafa will admit the justice of his demand for the release of the captured ship; for compensation to its owners and reparation to the United States for the injury to their flag.

The claims made by the undersigned then are three:

First. The immediate release of the ship *Charles and Jane* in the condition in all respects in which she was when captured on the High Seas.

Second. Compensation to the owners or their representative for the loss consequent on the capture.

Three. Reparation to the Government of the United States for the violation of its sovereignty, by capturing on the Great High Way of Nations a ship owned by citizens of that nation, and sailing under the sanctity of the national flag.³⁹

The satisfaction obtained by Chandler for these claims was

³⁹ Chandler to Cass, June 23, 1860. I am indebted to the courtesy of Dr. J. Franklin Jameson for the communication of this dispatch, and of other dispatches of Chandler to Cass.

neither immediate nor complete. A certain delay was to have been expected owing to a change of ministry and the preparation of a new Neapolitan constitution; finally, on June 28, de Martino, the new minister of foreign affairs, advised Chandler that the order had been given for full release of the *Charles and Jane*, but added that the release must be regarded "purely as an act of favor and of deference to the Government of the United States". The Neapolitan government wished it understood that it made "the most ample protest against all reclamation whatsoever founded upon the assumed illegality of the capture and its consequences". Chandler, now certain of the ship's immediate release, thanked de Martino for his "expression of deference to the United States Government", but firmly declared that he "did not feel at liberty to make any concessions in the case upon the right of the Neapolitan [war-ship] in the capture".⁴⁰ The diplomatic discussion over legal rights might have gone on endlessly—had it not been abruptly terminated by the end of the Neapolitan kingdom itself. The question of the American clipper was the last question which the United States had with the Bourbons of Naples, and it was never settled.

On July 9, the *Charles and Jane*, in tow of the Piedmontese war-ship *Tripoli*, returned safely with "passengers and cargo" to Genoa, where most of the released volunteers shipped on the steamer *Amazon*, leaving that port on July 15 for Sicily, and joined Garibaldi just in time to participate in the bloody battle of Milazzo.

Other expeditions to Sicily from Piedmontese ports followed with much regularity, but none were captured. The total number of volunteers transported soon reached twenty thousand, and offers for active service were received from many other citizens of the United States who wished to "lend a hand".⁴¹ American diplomatic

⁴⁰ Chandler to Cass, June 30, 1860.

⁴¹ One of these offers came from William Thomas Sampson, then a cadet in the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and in 1868 commander of the victorious American fleet at Santiago; the offer was transmitted in the following unpublished letter preserved in the archives of the Museo del Risorgimento, Castello Sforzesco, Milan:

U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., U. S. A.

Nov. 20, 1860.

GEN. GARIBALDI,

Sir,

Will the war of liberty be of still sufficient duration to justify our lending a hand? Mr. Sampson and myself will have ended a four years' course of study at this institution the coming summer, and if the war is to continue so that we

dispatches from Turin continued to report Garibaldi's victorious progress, and as Daniel wrote to Cass, the revolution of Southern Italy pursued an uninterrupted course to its goal, which was "the formation of a great Italian Kingdom".

H. NELSON GAY.

can have some encouragement to come over, please inform us. He is a young man of very fair talents, and stands at the head of our class.

Very respectfully,

T. STEECE.

WEBSTER'S SEVENTH OF MARCH SPEECH AND THE SECESSION MOVEMENT, 1850

THE moral earnestness and literary skill of Whittier, Lowell, Garrison, Phillips, and Parker have fixed in many minds the anti-slavery doctrine that Webster's 7th of March speech was "scandalous treachery", and Webster a man of little or no "moral sense", courage, or statesmanship. That bitter atmosphere, reproduced by Parton and von Holst, was perpetuated a generation later by Lodge.¹

Since 1900, over fifty publications throwing light on Webster and the Secession movement of 1850 have appeared, nearly a score containing fresh contemporary evidence. These twentieth-century historians—Garrison of Texas, Smith of Williams, Stephenson of Charleston and Yale, Van Tyne, Phillips, Fisher in his *True Daniel Webster*, or Ames, Hearon, and Cole in their monographs on Southern conditions—many of them born in one section and educated in another, brought into broadening relations with Northern and Southern investigators, trained in the modern historical spirit and freed by the mere lapse of time from much of the passion of slavery and civil war, have written with less emotion and more knowledge than the abolitionists, secessionists, or their disciples who preceded Rhodes.

Under the auspices of the American Historical Association have appeared the correspondence of Calhoun, of Chase, of Toombs, Stephens, and Cobb, and of Hunter of Virginia. Van Tyne's *Letters of Webster* (1902), including hundreds hitherto unpublished, was further supplemented in the sixteenth volume of the "National Edition" of Webster's *Writings and Speeches* (1908). These two editions contain, for 1850 alone, 57 inedited letters.

Manuscript collections and newspapers, comparatively unknown to earlier writers, have been utilized in monographs dealing with the situation in 1850 in South Carolina, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, Louisiana, and Tennessee, published by universities or historical societies.

The cooler and matured judgments of men who knew Webster personally—Foote, Stephens, Wilson, Seward, and Whittier, in the last century; Hoar, Hale, Fisher, Hosmer, and Wheeler in recent years—modify their partizan political judgments of 1850. The new printed evidence is confirmed by manuscript material: 2,500 letters

¹ Cf. Parton with Lodge on intellect, morals, indolence, drinking, 7th of March speech, Webster's favorite things in England; references, note 63, below.

of the Greenough Collection available since the publication of the recent editions of Webster's letters and apparently unused by Webster's biographers; and hundreds of still inedited Webster Papers in the New Hampshire Historical Society, and scattered in minor collections.² This mass of new material makes possible and desirable a re-examination of the evidence as to (1) the danger from the secession movement in 1850; (2) the reasons for Webster's change in attitude toward the disunion danger in February, 1850, and for his 7th of March speech; (3) the effects of his speech and attitude upon the secession movement.

During the session of Congress of 1849-1850, the peace of the Union was threatened by problems centring around slavery and the territory acquired as a result of the Mexican War: California's demand for admission with a constitution prohibiting slavery; the Wilmot Proviso excluding slavery from the rest of the Mexican acquisitions (Utah and New Mexico); the boundary dispute between Texas and New Mexico; the abolition of slave trade in the District of Columbia; and an effective fugitive slave law to replace that of 1793.

The evidence for the steadily growing danger of secession until March, 1850, is no longer to be sought in Congressional speeches, but rather in the private letters of those men, Northern and Southern, who were the shrewdest political advisers of the South, and in the official acts of representative bodies of Southerners in local or state meetings, state legislatures, and the Nashville Convention. Even after the compromise was accepted in the South and the secessionists defeated in 1850-1851, the Southern states generally adopted the Georgia platform or its equivalent declaring that the Wilmot Proviso or the repeal of the fugitive slave law would lead the South to "resist even (as a last resort) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union". Southern disunion sentiment was not sporadic or a party matter; it was endemic.

The disunion sentiment in the North was not general; but Garrison, publicly proclaiming "I am an abolitionist and therefore for the dissolution of the Union", and his followers who pronounced "the Constitution a covenant with death and an agreement with hell", exercised a twofold effect far in excess of their numbers. In the North, abolitionists aroused bitter antagonism to slavery; in the South they strengthened the conviction of the lawfulness of slavery and the

² Manuscripts in the Greenough, Hammond, and Clayton Collections (Library of Congress); Winthrop and Appleton Collections (Mass. Hist. Soc.); Garrison (Boston Public Library); N. H. Hist. Soc., Dartmouth College; Middletown (Conn.) Hist. Soc.; and in the possession of Mrs. Alfred E. Wyman.

desirability of secession in preference to abolition. "The abolition question must soon divide us", a South Carolinian wrote his former principal in Vermont. "We are beginning to look upon it [disunion] as a relief from incessant insult. I have been myself surprised at the unusual prevalence and depth of this feeling."³ "The abolition movement", as Houston has pointed out, "prevented any considerable abatement of feeling, and added volume to the current which was to sweep the State out of the Union in 1860."⁴ South Carolina's ex-governor, Hammond, wrote Calhoun in December, 1849, "the conduct of the abolitionists in congress is daily giving it [disunion] powerful aid". "The sooner we can get rid of it [the union] the better."⁵ The conclusion of both Blair of Kentucky and Winthrop⁶ of Massachusetts, that "Calhoun and his instruments are really solicitous to break up the Union", was warranted by Calhoun's own statement.

Calhoun, desiring to save the Union if he could, but at all events to save the South, and convinced that there was "no time to lose", hoped "a decisive issue will be made with the North". In February, 1850, he wrote, "Disunion is the only alternative that is left us".⁷ At last supported by some sort of action in thirteen Southern states, and in nine states by appointment of delegates to his Southern Convention, he declared in the Senate, March 4, "the South is united against the Wilmot proviso, and has committed itself, by solemn resolutions, to resist, should it be adopted". "The South will be forced to choose between abolition and secession." "The Southern States . . . cannot remain, as things now are, consistently with honor and safety, in the Union."⁸

That Beverley Tucker rightly judged that this speech of Calhoun expressed what was "in the mind of every man in the State" is confirmed by the approval of Hammond and other observers; their judgment that "everyone was ripe for disunion and no one ready to make

³ Bennett, Dec. 1, 1848, to Partridge, Norwich University. MS. Dartmouth.

⁴ Houston, *Nullification in South Carolina*, p. 141. Further evidence of Webster's thesis that abolitionists had developed Southern reaction in Phillips, *South in the Building of the Nation*, IV, 401-403; and unpublished letters approving Webster's speech.

⁵ Calhoun, *Corr.*, Amer. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report* (1899, vol. II.), pp. 1193-1194.

⁶ To Crittenden, Dec. 20, 1849, Smith, *Polit. Hist. Slavery*, I, 122; Winthrop MSS., Jan. 6, 1850.

⁷ Calhoun, *Corr.*, p. 781; cf. 764-766, 778, 780, 783-784.

⁸ *Cong. Globe*, XXI, 451-455, 463; *Corr.*, p. 784. On Calhoun's attitude, Ames, *Calhoun*, pp. 6-7; Stephenson, in *Yale Review*, 1919, p. 216; Newbury, in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XI, 259; Hamer, *Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1847-1852*, pp. 49-54.

a speech in favor of the union"; the testimony of the governor, that South Carolina "is ready and anxious for an immediate separation"; and the concurrent testimony of even the few "Unionists" like Petigru and Lieber, who wrote Webster, "almost everyone is for southern separation", "disunion is the . . . predominant sentiment". "For arming the state, \$350,000 has been put at the disposal of the governor." "Had I convened the legislature two or three weeks before the regular meeting," adds the governor, "such was the excited state of the public mind at that time, I am convinced South Carolina would not now have been a member of the Union. The people are very far ahead of their leaders." Ample first-hand evidence of South Carolina's determination to secede in 1850 may be found in the *Correspondence of Calhoun*, in Claiborne's *Quitman*, in the acts of the assembly, in the newspapers, in the legislature's vote "to resist at any and all hazards", and in the choice of resistance-men to the Nashville Convention and the state convention. This has been so convincingly set forth in Ames's *Calhoun and the Secession Movement of 1850*, and in Hamer's *Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1847-1852*, that there is need of very few further illustrations.⁹

That South Carolina postponed secession for ten years was due to the Compromise. Alabama and Virginia adopted resolutions accepting the Compromise in 1850-1851; and the Virginia legislature tactfully urged South Carolina to abandon secession. The 1851 elections in Alabama, Georgia, and Mississippi showed the South ready to accept the Compromise, the crucial test being in Mississippi, where the voters followed Webster's supporter, Foote.¹⁰ That Petigru was right in maintaining that South Carolina merely abandoned immediate and separate secession is shown by the almost unanimous vote of the South Carolina State Convention of 1852,¹¹ that the state was amply justified "in dissolving at once all political connection with her co-States", but refrained from this "manifest right of self-government from considerations of expediency only".¹²

In Mississippi, a preliminary convention, instigated by Calhoun, recommended the holding of a Southern convention at Nashville in

⁹ Calhoun, *Corr.*, Amer. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report* (1899, vol. II.), pp. 1210-1212; Toombs, *Corr.*, (*id.*, 1911, vol. II.), pp. 188, 217; Coleman, *Crittenden*, I, 363; Hamer, pp. 55-56, 46-48, 54, 82-83; Ames, *Calhoun*, pp. 21-22, 29; Claiborne, *Quitman*, II, 36-39.

¹⁰ Hearon, *Miss. and the Compromise of 1850*, p. 209.

¹¹ A letter to Webster, Oct. 22, 1851, Greenough MSS., shows the strength of Calhoun's secession ideas. Hamer, p. 125, quotes part.

¹² Hamer, p. 142; Hearon, p. 220.

June, 1850, to "adopt some mode of resistance". The "Resolutions" declared the Wilmot Proviso "such a breach of the federal compact as . . . will make it the duty . . . of the slave-holding states to treat the non-slave-holding states as enemies". The "Address" recommended "all the assailed states to provide in the last resort for their separate welfare by the formation of a compact and a Union". "The object of this [Nashville Convention] is to familiarize the public mind with the idea of dissolution", rightly judged the *Richmond Whig* and the *Lynchburg Virginian*.

Radical resistance men controlled the legislature and "cordially approved" the disunion resolution and address, chose delegates to the Nashville Convention, appropriated \$20,000 for their expenses and \$200,000 for "necessary measures for protecting the state . . . in the event of the passage of the Wilmot Proviso", etc.¹³ These actions of Mississippi's legislature one day before Webster's 7th of March speech mark approximately the peak of the secession movement.

Governor Quitman, in response to public demand, called the legislature and proposed "to recommend the calling of a regular convention . . . with full power to annul the federal compact". "Having no hope of an effectual remedy . . . but in separation from the Northern States, my views of state action will look to secession."¹⁴ The legislature supported Quitman's and Jefferson Davis's plans for resistance, censured Foote's support of the Compromise, and provided for a state convention of delegates.¹⁵

Even the Mississippi "Unionists" adopted the six standard points generally accepted in the South which would justify resistance. "And this is the Union party", was the significant comment of the *New York Tribune*. This Union Convention, however, believed that Quitman's message was treasonable and that there was ample evidence of a plot to dissolve the Union and form a Southern confederacy. Their programme was adopted by the State Convention the following year.¹⁶ The radical Mississippians reiterated Calhoun's constitutional guarantees of sectional equality and non-interference with slavery, and declared for a Southern convention with power to recommend "secession from the Union and the formation of a Southern confederacy".¹⁷

"The people of Mississippi seemed . . . determined to defend

¹³ Mar. 6, 1850. *Laws* (Miss.), pp. 521-526.

¹⁴ Claiborne, *Quitman*, II. 37; Hearon, p. 161 n.

¹⁵ Hearon, pp. 180-181; Claiborne, *Quitman*, II. 51-52.

¹⁶ Nov. 10, 1850, Hearon, pp. 178-180; 1851, pp. 209-212.

¹⁷ Dec. 10, Southern Rights Assoc. Hearon, pp. 183-187.

their equality in the Union, or to retire from it by peaceable secession. Had the issue been pressed at the moment when the excitement was at its highest point, an isolated and very serious movement might have occurred, which South Carolina, without doubt, would have promptly responded to."¹⁸

In Georgia, evidence as to "which way the wind blows" was received by the Congressional trio, Alexander Stephens, Toombs, and Cobb, from trusted observers at home. "The only safety of the South from abolition universal is to be found in an early dissolution of the Union." Only one democrat was found justifying Cobb's opposition to Calhoun and the Southern Convention.¹⁹

Stephens himself, anxious to "stick to the Constitutional Union", reveals in confidential letters to Southern Unionists the rapidly growing danger of disunion. "The feeling among the Southern members for a dissolution of the Union . . . is becoming much more general." "Men are now [December, 1849] beginning to talk of it seriously who twelve months ago hardly permitted themselves to think of it." "Civil war in this country better be prevented if it can be." After a month's "farther and broader view", he concluded, "the crisis is not far ahead . . . a dismemberment of this Republic I now consider inevitable."²⁰

On February 8, 1850, the Georgia legislature appropriated \$30,000 for a state convention to consider measures of redress, and gave warning that anti-slavery aggressions would "induce us to contemplate the possibility of a dissolution".²¹ "I see no prospect of a continuance of this Union long", wrote Stephens two days later.²²

Speaker Cobb's advisers warned him that "the predominant feeling of Georgia" was "equality or disunion", and that "the destructives" were trying to drive the South into disunion. "But for your influence, Georgia would have been more rampant for dissolution than South Carolina ever was." "S. Carolina will secede, but we can and must put a stop to it in Georgia."²³

Public opinion in Georgia, which had been "almost ready for immediate secession", was reversed only after the passage of the Compromise and by means of a strenuous campaign against the Seces-

¹⁸ Claiborne, *Quitman*, II. 52.

¹⁹ July 1, 1849. *Corr.*, p. 170 (Amer. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1911, vol. II.).

²⁰ Johnston, *Stephens*, pp. 238-239, 244; Smith, *Political History of Slavery*, I. 121.

²¹ *Lates* (Ga.), 1850, pp. 122, 405-410.

²² Johnston, *Stephens*, p. 247.

²³ *Corr.*, pp. 184, 193-195, 206-208, July 21. Newspapers, see Brooks, in *Miss. Valley Hist. Review*, IX. 289.

sionists which Stephens, Toombs, and Cobb were obliged to return to Georgia to conduct to a successful issue.²⁴ Yet even the Unionist Convention of Georgia, elected by this campaign, voted almost unanimously "the Georgia platform" already described, of resistance, even to disruption, against the Wilmot Proviso, the repeal of the fugitive slave law, and the other measures generally selected for reprobation in the South.²⁵ "Even the existence of the Union depended upon the settlement"; "we would have resisted by our arms if the wrong [Wilmot Proviso] had been perpetuated", were Stephens's later judgments.²⁶ It is to be remembered that the Union victory in Georgia was based upon the Compromise and that Webster's share in "strengthening the friends of the Union" was recognized by Stephens.

The disunion movement manifested also dangerous strength in Virginia and Alabama, and showed possibilities of great danger in Tennessee, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Texas, and Arkansas. The majority of the people may not have favored secession in 1850 any more than in 1860; but the leaders could and did carry most of the Southern legislatures in favor of uniting for resistance.

The "ultras" in Virginia, under the lead of Tucker, and in Alabama under Yancey, frankly avowed their desire to stimulate impossible demands so that disunion would be inevitable. Tucker at Nashville "ridiculed Webster's assertion that the Union could not be dissolved without bloodshed". On the eve of Webster's speech, Garnett of Virginia published a frank advocacy of a Southern Confederacy, repeatedly reprinted, which Clay declared "the most dangerous pamphlet he had ever read".²⁷ Virginia, in providing for delegates to the Nashville Convention, announced her readiness to join her "sister slave states" for "mutual defence". She later acquiesced in the Compromise, but reasserted that anti-slavery aggressions would "defeat restoration of peaceful sentiments".²⁸

²⁴ Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights*, pp. 163-166.

²⁵ Ames, *Documents*, pp. 271-272; Heaton, p. 190.

²⁶ 1854, *Amer. Hist. Review*, VIII, 92-97; 1857, Johnston, *Stephens*, pp. 321-322; *infra*, pp. 267, 268.

²⁷ Hammond MSS., Jan. 27, Feb. 8; Virginia Resolves, Feb. 12; Ambler, *Sectionalism in Virginia*, p. 246; N. Y. *Tribune*, June 14; M. R. H. Garnett, *Union Past and Future*, published between Jan. 24 and Mar. 7. Alabama: Hodgson, *Cradle of the Confederacy*, p. 281; Dubose, *Yancey*, pp. 247-249, 481; Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, p. 13; Cobb, *Corr.*, pp. 193-195, 207. President Tyler of the College of William and Mary kindly furnished evidence of Garnett's authorship; see J. M. Garnett, in *Southern Literary Messenger*, XVI, 255.

²⁸ Resolutions, Feb. 12, 1850; *Acts*, 1850, pp. 223-224; 1851, p. 201.

In Texas there was acute danger of collision over the New Mexico boundary with Federal troops which President Taylor was preparing to send. Stephens frankly repeated Quitman's threats of Southern armed support of Texas.²⁹ Cobb, Henderson of Texas, Duval of Kentucky, Anderson of Tennessee, and Goode of Virginia expressed similar views as to the "imminent cause of danger to the Union from Texas". The collision was avoided because the more statesmanlike attitude of Webster prevailed rather than the "soldier's" policy of Taylor.

The border states held a critical position in 1850, as they did in 1860. "If they go for the Southern movement we shall have disunion." "Everything is to depend from this day on the course of Kentucky, Tennessee and Missouri."³⁰ Webster's conciliatory Union policy, in harmony with that of border state leaders, like Bell of Tennessee, Benton of Missouri, Clay and Crittenden of Kentucky, enabled Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri to stand by the Union and refuse to send delegates to the Nashville Convention.

The attitude of the Southern states toward disunion may be followed closely in their action as to the Nashville Convention. Nine Southern states approved the Convention and appointed delegates before June, 1850, six during the critical month preceding Webster's speech: Georgia, February 6, 8; Texas and Tennessee, February 11; Virginia, February 12; Alabama, just before the adjournment of the legislature, February 13; Mississippi, March 5, 6.³¹ Every one of the nine seceded in 1860-1861; the border states (Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri) which kept out of the Convention in 1850 likewise kept out of secession in 1861; and only two states which seceded in 1861 failed to join the Southern movement in 1850 (North Carolina and Louisiana). This significant parallel between the action of the Southern states in 1850 and in 1860 suggests the permanent strength of the secession movement of 1850. Moreover, the alignment of leaders was strikingly the same in 1850 and 1860. Those who headed the secession movement in 1850 in their respective states were among the leaders of secession in 1860 and 1861: Barnwell and Rhett in South Carolina; Yancey in Alabama; Jefferson Davis and Brown in Mississippi; Garnett, Goode, and Hunter in Virginia; Johnston in Arkansas; Clingman in North Carolina. On the other hand, nearly

²⁹ Stephens, *Corr.*, p. 192; *Globe*, XXII. II. 1208.

³⁰ *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Feb. 23.

³¹ South Carolina, *Acts*, 1849, p. 240, and the following *Laws or Acts*, all 1850: Georgia, pp. 418, 405-410, 122; Texas, pp. 93-94, 171; Tennessee, p. 572 (*Globe*, XXI. I. 417. Cole, *Whig Party in the South*, p. 161); Mississippi, pp. 526-528; Virginia, p. 233; Alabama, *Weekly Tribune*, Feb. 23, *Daily*, Feb. 25.

all the men who in 1850 favored the Compromise, in 1860 either remained Union men, like Crittenden, Houston of Texas, Sharkey, Lieber, Petigru, and Provost Kennedy of Baltimore, or, like Stephens, Morehead, and Foote, vainly tried to restrain secession.

In the states unrepresented at the Nashville Convention—Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Louisiana—there was much sympathy with the Southern movement. In Louisiana, the governor's proposal to send delegates was blocked by the Whigs.³² "Missouri", in case of the Wilmot Proviso, "will be found in hearty co-operation with the slave-holding states for mutual protection against . . . Northern fanaticism", her legislature resolved.³³ Missouri's instructions to her senators were denounced as "disunion in their object" by her own Senator Benton. The Maryland legislature resolved, February 26: "Maryland will take her position with her Southern sister states in the maintenance of the constitution with all its compromises." The Whig senate, however, prevented sanctioning of the convention and sending of delegates. Florida's governor wrote the governor of South Carolina that Florida would co-operate with Virginia and South Carolina "in any measures in defense of our common Constitution and sovereign dignity". "Florida has resolved to resist to the extent of revolution", declared her representative in Congress, March 5. Though the Whigs did not support the movement, five delegates came from Florida to the Nashville Convention.³⁴

In Kentucky, Crittenden's repeated messages against "disunion" and "entangling engagements" reveal the danger seen by a Southern Union governor.³⁵ Crittenden's changing attitude reveals the growing peril, and the growing reliance on Webster's and Clay's plans. By April, Crittenden recognized that "the Union is endangered", "the case . . . rises above ordinary rules", "circumstances have rather changed". He reluctantly swung from Taylor's plan of dealing with California alone, to the Clay and Webster idea of settling the "whole controversy".³⁶ Representative Morehead wrote Crittenden, "The extreme Southern gentlemen would secretly deplore the settlement of this question. The magnificence of a Southern Confederacy . . . is a dazzling allurements." Clay, like Webster, saw "the alternative, civil war".³⁷

³² White, *Miss. Valley Hist. Assoc.*, III, 283.

³³ *Senate Miscellaneous*, 1849-1850, no. 24.

³⁴ Hamer, p. 40; cf. Cole, *Whig Party in the South*, p. 162; *Cong. Globe*, Mar. 5.

³⁵ Coleman, *Crittenden*, I, 333, 350.

³⁶ Clayton MSS., Apr. 6; cf. Coleman, *Crittenden*, I, 360.

³⁷ Smith, *History of Slavery*, I, 121; Clay, Oct., 1851, letter, Curtis, *Webster*, II, 584-585.

In North Carolina, the majority appear to have been loyal to the Union; but the extremists—typified by Clingman, the public meeting at Wilmington, and the newspapers like the *Wilmington Courier*—reveal the presence of a dangerously aggressive body “with a settled determination to dissolve the Union” and frankly “calculating the advantages of a Southern Confederacy”. Southern observers in this state reported that “the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law or the abolition of slavery in the District will dissolve the Union”. The North Carolina legislature acquiesced in the Compromise but counselled retaliation in case of anti-slavery aggressions.³⁸ Before the assembling of the Southern convention in June, every one of the Southern states, save Kentucky, had given some encouragement to the Southern movement, and Kentucky had given warning and proposed a compromise through Clay.³⁹

Nine Southern states—Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, Arkansas, Florida, and Tennessee—sent about 176 delegates to the Nashville Convention. The comparatively harmless outcome of this convention, in June, led earlier historians to underestimate the danger of the resistance movement in February and March when backed by legislatures, newspapers, and public opinion, before the effect was felt of the death of Calhoun and Taylor, and of Webster's support of conciliation. Stephens and the Southern Unionists rightly recognized that the Nashville Convention “will be the nucleus of another sectional assembly”. “A fixed alienation of feeling will be the result.” “The game of the destructives is to use the Missouri Compromise principle [as demanded by the Nashville Convention] as a medium of defeating all adjustments and then to . . . infuriate the South and drive her into measures that must end in disunion.” “All who go to the Nashville Convention are ultimately to fall into that position.” This view is confirmed by Judge Warner and other observers in Georgia and by the unpublished letters of Tucker.⁴⁰ “Let the Nashville Convention be held”, said the *Columbus, Georgia, Sentinel*, “and let the undivided voice of the South go forth . . . declaring our determination to resist even to civil war.”⁴¹ The speech of Rhett of South Carolina, author of the convention's “Address”, “frankly and boldly unfurled the flag of disunion”.

³⁸ Clingman, and Wilmington Resolutions, *Globe*, XXI, I, 200-205, 311; *National Intelligencer*, Feb. 25; Cobb, *Corr.*, pp. 217-218; Boyd, “North Carolina on the Eve of Secession”, in *Amer. Hist. Assoc., Annual Report* (1910), pp. 167-177.

³⁹ Hearndon, *Nashville Convention*, p. 283.

⁴⁰ Johnston, *Stephens*, p. 247; *Corr.*, pp. 186, 193, 194, 206-207; Hammond MSS., Jan. 27, Feb. 8.

⁴¹ Ames, *Calhoun*, p. 26.

"If every Southern State should quail . . . South Carolina alone should make the issue." "The opinion of the [Nashville] address is, and I believe the opinion of a large portion of the Southern people is, that the Union cannot be made to endure", was delegate Barnwell's admission to Webster.⁴²

The influence of the Compromise is brought out in the striking change in the attitude of Senator Foote, and of Judge Sharkey of Mississippi, the author of the radical "Address" of the preliminary Mississippi Convention, and chairman of both this and the Nashville Convention. After the Compromise measures were reported in May by Clay and Webster's committee, Sharkey became convinced that the Compromise should be accepted and so advised Foote. Sharkey also visited Washington and helped to pacify the rising storm by "suggestions to individual Congressmen".⁴³ In the Nashville Convention, Sharkey therefore exercised a moderating influence as chairman and refused to sign its disunion address. Convinced that the Compromise met essential Southern demands, Sharkey urged that "to resist it would be to dismember the Union". He therefore refused to call a second meeting of the Nashville Convention. For this change in position he was bitterly criticized by Jefferson Davis.⁴⁴ Foote recognized the "emergency" at the same time that Webster did, and on February 25, proposed his committee of thirteen to report some "scheme of compromise". Parting company with Calhoun, March 5, on the thesis that the South could not safely remain without new "constitutional guarantees", Foote regarded Webster's speech as "unanswerable", and in April came to an understanding with him as to Foote's committee and their common desire for prompt consideration of California. The importance of Foote's influence in turning the tide in Mississippi, through his pugnacious election campaign, and the significance of his judgment of the influence of Webster and his speech have been somewhat overlooked, partly perhaps because of Foote's swashbuckling characteristics.⁴⁵

That the Southern convention movement proved comparatively innocuous in June is due in part to confidence inspired by the conciliatory policy of one outstanding Northerner, Webster. "Webster's speech", said Winthrop, "has knocked the Nashville Convention into a cocked hat."⁴⁶ "The Nashville Convention has been

⁴² Webster, *Writings and Speeches*, X, 161-162.

⁴³ *Cyclopedia Miss. Hist.*, art. "Sharkey".

⁴⁴ Hearon, pp. 124, 171-174. Davis to Clayton (Clayton MSS.), Nov. 22, 1851.

⁴⁵ *Globe*, XXI, I, 418, 124, 712; *infra*, p. 268.

⁴⁶ MSS., Mar. 10.

blown by your giant effort to the four winds." ⁴⁷ "Had you spoken out before this, I verily believe the Nashville Convention had not been thought of. Your speech has disarmed and quieted the South." ⁴⁸ Webster's speech occasioned hesitation in the South. "This has given courage to all who wavered in their resolution or who were secretly opposed to the measure [Nashville Convention]." ⁴⁹

Ames cites nearly a score of issues of newspapers in Mississippi, South Carolina, Louisiana, North Carolina, Georgia, and Virginia reflecting the change in public opinion in March. Even some of the radical papers referred to the favorable effect of Webster's speech and "spirit" in checking excitement. "The Jackson (Mississippi) *Southron* had at first supported the movement [for a Southern Convention], but by March it had grown lukewarm and before the Convention assembled, decidedly opposed it. The last of May it said, 'not a Whig paper in the State approves'." In the latter part of March, not more than a quarter of sixty papers from ten slaveholding states took decided ground for a Southern Convention. ⁵⁰ The *Mississippi Free Trader* tried to check the growing support of the Compromise, by claiming that Webster's speech lacked Northern backing. A South Carolina pamphlet cited the Massachusetts opposition to Webster as proof of the political strength of abolition. ⁵¹

The newer, day by day, first-hand evidence, in print and manuscript, shows the Union in serious danger, with the culmination during the three weeks preceding Webster's speech; with a moderation during March; a growing readiness during the summer to await Congressional action; and slow acquiescence in the Compromise measures of September, but with frank assertion on the part of various Southern states of the right and duty of resistance if the compromise measures were violated. Even in December, 1850, Dr. Alexander of Princeton found sober Virginians fearful that repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act would throw Virginia into the Southern movement and that South Carolina "by some rash act" would precipitate "the crisis". "All seem to regard bloodshed as the inevitable result." ⁵²

To the judgments and legislative acts of Southerners already quoted, may be added some of the opinions of men from the North.

⁴⁷ Anstell, Bethlehem, May 21, Greenough Collection.

⁴⁸ Anderson, Tenn., Apr. 8, *ibid.*

⁴⁹ Goode, *Hunter Corr.*, Amer. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report* (1916, vol. II.), p. 111.

⁵⁰ Ames, *Calhoun*, pp. 24-27.

⁵¹ Hearon, pp. 120-123; Anonymous, *Letter on Southern Wrongs . . . in Reply to Grayson* (Charleston, 1850).

⁵² *Letters*, II. 111, 121, 127.

Erving, the diplomat, wrote from New York. "The real danger is in the fanatics and disunionists of the North". "I see no salvation but in the total abandonment of the Wilmot Proviso." Edward Everett, on the contrary, felt that "unless some southern men of influence have courage enough to take grounds against the extension of slavery and in favor of abolition . . . we shall infallibly separate".⁵³

A Philadelphia editor who went to Washington to learn the real sentiments of the Southern members, reported February 1, that if the Wilmot Proviso were not given up, ample provision made for fugitive slaves and avoidance of interference with slavery in the District of Columbia, the South would secede, though this was not generally believed in the North. "The North must decide whether she would have the Wilmot Proviso without the Union or the Union without the Wilmot Proviso."⁵⁴

In answer to inquiries from the Massachusetts legislature as to whether the Southern attitude was "bluster" or "firm Resolve", Winthrop wrote, "the country has never been in more serious exigency than at present". "The South is angry, mad." "The Union must be saved . . . by prudence and forbearance." "Most sober men here are apprehensive that the end of the Union is nearer than they have ever before imagined." "God Preserve the Union is my daily prayer", wrote General Scott.⁵⁵

Webster, however, as late as February 14, believed that there was no "serious danger". February 16, he still felt that "if, on our side, we keep cool, things will come to no dangerous pass".⁵⁶ But within the next week, three acts in Washington modified Webster's optimism: the filibuster of Southern members, February 18; their triumph in conference, February 19; their interview with Taylor about February 23.

On February 18, under the leadership of Stephens, the Southern representatives mustered two-thirds of the Southern Whigs and a majority from every Southern state save Maryland for a successful series of over thirty filibustering votes against the admission of California without consideration of the question of slavery in New Mexico and Utah. So indisputable was the demonstration of Southern power to block not only the President's plan but all Congressional legislation, that the Northern leaders next day in conference with Southern representatives agreed that California should be admitted with her free constitution, but that in New Mexico and Utah govern-

⁵³ Winthrop MSS., Jan. 16, Feb. 7.

⁵⁴ Philadelphia *Bulletin*, in McMaster, VIII, 15.

⁵⁵ Winthrop MSS., Feb. 10, 6.

⁵⁶ *Writings and Speeches*, XVI, 533; XVIII, 355.

ment should be organized with no prohibition of slavery and with power to form, in respect to slavery, such constitutions as the people pleased—agreements practically enacted in the Compromise.⁵⁷

The filibuster of the 18th of February, Mann described as "a revolutionary proceeding". Its alarming effect on the members of the Cabinet was commented upon by the *Boston Advertiser*, February 19. The *New York Tribune*, February 20, recognized the determination of the South to secede unless the Missouri Compromise line were extended to the Pacific. February 22, the *Springfield Republican* declared that "if the Union cannot be preserved without the extension of slavery, we allow the tie of Union to be severed". It was on this day, too, that Webster decided "to make a Union speech and discharge a clear conscience".

That same week (apparently February 23) occurred the famous interview of Stephens and Toombs with Taylor which convinced the President that the Southern movement "means disunion". This was Taylor's judgment expressed to Weed and Hamlin, "ten minutes after the interview". A week later the President seemed to Horace Mann to be talking like a child about his plans to levy an embargo and blockade the Southern harbors and "save the Union". Taylor was ready to appeal to arms against "these Southern men in Congress [who] are trying to bring on civil war" in connection with the critical Texas boundary question.⁵⁸

On this 23d of February, Greeley, converted from his earlier and characteristic optimism, wrote in his leading editorial, "instead of scouting or ridiculing as chimerical the idea of a Dissolution of the Union, we firmly believe that there are sixty members of Congress who this day desire it and are plotting to effect it. We have no doubt the Nashville Convention will be held and that the leading purpose of its authors is the separation of the slave states . . . with the formation of an independent Confederacy." "This plot . . . is formidable." He warned against "needless provocation" which would "supply weapons to the Disunionists". A private letter to Greeley from Washington, the same day, says: "H— is alarmed and confident that blood will be spilt on the floor of the House. Many members go to the House armed every day. W— is confident that

⁵⁷ Stephens, *War between the States*, II, 201-205, 232; *Cong. Globe*, XXI, I, 375-384.

⁵⁸ Thurlow Weed, *Life*, II, 177-178, 180-181 (Gen. Pleasanton's confirmatory letter). Wilson, *Slave Power*, II, 249. Both corroborated by Hamline letter, Rhodes, I, 134. Stephens's letters, *N. Y. Herald*, July 13, Aug. 8, 1876, denying threatening language used by Taylor "in my presence", do not nullify evidence of Taylor's attitude. Mann, *Life*, p. 292. Private Washington letter, Feb. 23, reporting interview, *N. Y. Tribune*, Feb. 25.

Disunionism is now inevitable. He knows intimately nearly all the Southern members, is familiar with their views and sees the letters that reach them from their constituents. He says the most ultra are well backed up in their advices from home."⁵⁹

The same February 23, the *Boston Advertiser* quoted the Washington correspondence of the *Journal of Commerce*: "excitement pervades the whole South, and Southern members say that it has gone beyond their control, that their tone is moderate in comparison with that of their people." "Persons who condemn Mr. Clay's resolutions now trust to some vague idea that Mr. Webster can do something better." "If Mr. Webster has any charm by the magic influence of which he can control the *ultraism* of the North and of the South, he cannot too soon try its effects." "If Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri go for the Southern movement, we shall have disunion and as much of war as may answer the purposes either of Northern or Southern fanaticism." On this Saturday, February 23, also, "several Southern members of Congress had a long and interesting interview with Mr. Webster". "The whole subject was discussed and the result is, that the limitations of a compromise have been examined, which are satisfactory to our Southern brethren. This is good news, and will surround Mr. Webster's position with an uncommon interest."⁶⁰

"Webster is the only man in the Senate who has a position which would enable him to present a plan which would be carried", said Pratt of Maryland.⁶¹ The *National Intelligencer*, which had hitherto maintained the safety of the Union, confessed by February 21 that "the integrity of the Union is at some hazard", quoting Southern evidence of this. On February 25, Foote, in proposing to the Senate a committee of thirteen to report some scheme of compromise, gave it as his conclusion from consultation with both houses, that unless something were done at once, power would pass from Congress.

It was under these highly critical circumstances that Webster, on Sunday, February 24, the day on which he was accustomed to dine with his unusually well-informed friends, Stephens, Toombs, Clay, and Hale, wrote to his only surviving son:

I am nearly broken down with labor and anxiety. I know not how to meet the present emergency, or with what weapons to beat down the

⁵⁹ *Weekly Tribune*, Mar. 2, reprinted from *Daily*, Feb. 27. Cf. *Washington National Intelligencer*, Feb. 21, quoting: *Richmond Enquirer*; *Wilmington Commercial*; *Columbia Telegraph*.

⁶⁰ *New York Herald*, Feb. 25; *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Feb. 26.

⁶¹ *Tribune*, Feb. 25.

Northern and Southern follies, now raging in equal extremes. . . . I have poor spirits and little courage. *Non sum qualis eram.*⁶²

Mr. Lodge's account of this critical February period shows ignorance not only of the letter of February 24, but of the real situation. He misquotes von Holst and from unwarranted assumptions draws like conclusions. Before this letter of February 24 and the new cumulative evidence of the crisis, there falls to the ground the sneer in Mr. Lodge's question, "if [Webster's] anxiety was solely of a public nature, why did it date from March 7 when, prior to that time, there was much greater cause for alarm than afterwards?" Webster ~~was~~ anxious before the 7th of March, as so many others were, North and South, and his extreme anxiety appears in the letter of February 24, as well as in repeated later utterances. No one can read through the letters of Webster without recognizing that he had a genuine anxiety for the safety of the Union; and that neither in his letters nor elsewhere is there evidence that in his conscience he was "ill at ease" or "his mind not at peace". Here as elsewhere, Mr. Lodge's biography, written nearly forty years ago, reproduces anti-slavery bitterness and ignorance of facts (pardonable in 1850) and seriously misrepresents Webster's character and the situation in that year.⁶³

By the last week in February and the first in March, the peak of the secession movement was reached. Like others who loved the Union, convinced during this critical last week in February of an "emergency", Webster determined to make his "Union Speech" and "push the skiff from the shore alone". "We are in a crisis," he wrote again June 2, "if conciliation makes no progress." "It is a great emergency that the country is placed in", he said in the Senate, June 17. "We have," he wrote in October, "gone through the most important crisis which has occurred since the foundation of the government." A year later he added at Buffalo, "if we had not settled these agitating questions [by the Compromise] . . . in my opinion, there would have been civil war". In Virginia, where he had known the situation even better, he declared, "I believe in my conscience that a crisis was at hand, a dangerous, a fearful crisis".⁶⁴

Rhodes's conclusion that there was "little danger of an overt act of secession while General Taylor was in the presidential chair" was based on evidence then incomplete and is abandoned by more recent

⁶² *Writings and Speeches*, XVI. 534.

⁶³ Lodge's reproduction of Parton, pp. 16-17, 98, 195, 325-326, 349, 353, 356, 360. Other errors in Lodge's *Webster*, pp. 45, 314, 322, 328, 329-330, 352.

⁶⁴ *Writings and Speeches*, XVI. 542, 568; X. 116; Curtis, *Life*, II. 596; XIII. 434.

historians. It is moreover significant that, of the speeches cited by Rhodes, ridiculing the danger of secession, not one was delivered *before* Webster's speech. All were uttered *after* the danger had been lessened by the speeches and attitude of Clay and Webster. Even such Northern anti-slavery speeches illustrated danger of another sort. Hale of New Hampshire "would let them go" rather than surrender the rights threatened by the fugitive slave bill.⁶⁵ Giddings in the very speech ridiculing the danger of disunion said, "when they see fit to leave the Union, I would say to them 'Go in peace'".⁶⁶ Such utterances played into the hands of secessionists, strengthening their convictions that the North despised the South and would not fight to keep her in the Union.

It is now clear that in 1850 as in 1860 the average Northern senator or anti-slavery minister or poet was ill-informed or careless as to the danger of secession, and that Webster and the Southern Unionists were well-informed and rightly anxious. Theodore Parker illustrated the bitterness that befalls the mind. He concluded that there was no danger of dissolution because "the public funds of the United States did not go down one mill". The stock market might, of course, change from many causes, but Parker was wrong as to the facts. An examination of the daily sales of United States bonds in New York, 1849-1850, shows that the change, instead of being "not one mill", as Parker asserted, was four or five dollars during this period; and what change there was, was downward before Webster's speech and upward thereafter.⁶⁷

We now realize what Webster knew and feared in 1849-1850. "If this strife between the South and the North goes on, we shall have war, and who is ready for that?" "There would have been a Civil War if the Compromise had not passed." The evidence confirms Thurlow Weed's mature judgment: "the country had every appearance of being on the eve of a Revolution."⁶⁸ On February 28, Everett recognized that "the radicals at the South have made up their minds to separate, the catastrophe seems to be inevitable".⁶⁹

On March 1, Webster recorded his determination "to make an honest truth-telling speech and a Union speech". The Washington correspondent of the *Advertiser*, March 4, reported that Webster will

⁶⁵ Mar. 19, *Cong. Globe*, XXII. II. 1063.

⁶⁶ Aug. 12, *ibid.*, p. 1562.

⁶⁷ *U. S. Bonds* (1867). About 112-113, Dec., Jan., Feb., 1850; "inactive" before Webster's speech; "firmer", Mar. 8; advanced to 117, 119, May; 116-117 after Compromise.

⁶⁸ E. P. Wheeler, *Sixty Years of American Life*, p. 6; cf. Webster's Buffalo Speech, Curtis, *Life*, II. 576; Weed, *Autobiography*, p. 396.

⁶⁹ Winthrop MSS.

"take a large view of the state of things and advocate a straightforward course of legislation essentially such as the President has recommended". "To this point public sentiment has been gradually converging." "It will tend greatly to confirm opinion in favor of this course should it meet with the decided concurrence of Mr. Webster." The attitude of the plain citizen is expressed by Barker, of Beaver, Pennsylvania, on the same day, "do it, Mr. Webster, as you can, do it as a bold and gifted statesman and patriot; reconcile the North and South and *preserve* the Union". "Offer, Mr. Webster, a liberal compromise to the South." On March 4 and 5, Calhoun's Senate speech reasserted that the South, no longer safe in the Union, possessed the right of peaceable secession. On the 6th of March, Webster went over the proposed speech of the next morning with his son Fletcher, Edward Curtis, and Peter Harvey.⁷⁰

It was under the cumulative stress of such convincing evidence, public and private utterances, and acts in Southern legislatures and in Congress, that Webster made his Union speech on the 7th of March. The purpose and character of the speech are rightly indicated by its title, "The Constitution and the Union", and by the significant dedication to the people of Massachusetts: "Necessity compels me to speak true rather than pleasing things." "I should indeed like to please you; but I prefer to save you, whatever be your attitude toward me."⁷¹ The malignant charge that this speech was "a bid for the presidency" was long ago discarded, even by Lodge. It unfortunately survives in text-books more concerned with "atmosphere" than with truth. The modern investigator finds no evidence for it and every evidence against it. Webster was both too proud and too familiar with the political situation, North and South, to make such a monstrous mistake. The printed or manuscript letters to or from Webster in 1850 and 1851 show him and his friends deeply concerned over the danger to the Union, but not about the presidency. There is rarest mention of the matter in letters by personal or political friends; none by Webster, so far as the writer has observed.

If one comes to the speech familiar with both the situation in 1850 as now known, and with Webster's earlier and later speeches and private letters, one finds his position and arguments on the 7th of March in harmony with his attitude toward Union and slavery.

⁷⁰ Webster to Harvey, Apr. 7, MS. Middletown (Conn.) Hist. Soc., adds Fletcher's name. Received through the kindness of Professor George M. Dutcher.

⁷¹ *Writings and Speeches*, X, 57; "Notes for the Speech", 281-291; Winthrop MSS., Apr. 3.

and with the law and the facts. Frankly reiterating both his earlier view of slavery "as a great moral, political and social evil" and his lifelong devotion to the Union and its constitutional obligations, Webster took national, practical, courageous grounds. On the fugitive slave bill and the Wilmot Proviso, where cautious Whigs like Winthrop and Everett were inclined to keep quiet in view of Northern popular feeling, Webster "took a large view of things" and resolved, as Foote saw, to risk his reputation in advocating the only practicable solution. Not only was Webster thoroughly familiar with the facts, but he was pre-eminently logical and, as Calhoun had admitted, once convinced, "he cannot look truth in the face and oppose it by arguments".⁷² He therefore boldly faced the truth that the Wilmot Proviso (as it proved later) was needless, and would irritate Southern Union men and play into hands of disunionists who frankly desired to exploit this "insult" to excite secession sentiment. In a like case ten years later, "the Republican party took precisely the same ground held by Mr. Webster in 1850 and acted from the motives that inspired the 7th of March speech".⁷³

Webster's anxiety for a conciliatory settlement of the highly dangerous Texas boundary situation (which incidentally narrowed slave territory) was as consistent with his national Union policy, as his desires for California's admission as a free state and for prohibition of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia were in accord with his opposition to slavery. Seeing both abolitionists and secessionists threatening the Union, he rebuked both severely for disloyalty to their "constitutional obligations", while he pleaded for a more conciliatory attitude, for faith and charity rather than "heated imaginations". The only logical alternative to the union policy was disunion, advocated alike by Garrisonian abolitionists and Southern secessionists. "The Union . . . was thought to be in danger, and devotion to the Union rightfully inclined men to yield . . . where nothing else could have so inclined them", was Lincoln's luminous defense of the Compromise in his debate with Douglas.⁷⁴

Webster's support of the constitutional provision for "return of persons held to service" was not merely that of a lawyer. It was in accord with a deep and statesmanlike conviction that "obedience to established government . . . is a Christian duty", the seat of law is "the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the universe".⁷⁵ Offensive as this law was to the North, the only logical alternatives were

⁷² *Writings and Speeches*, XVIII, 371-372.

⁷³ Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*, I, 269-271.

⁷⁴ *Works*, II, 202-203.

⁷⁵ *Writings and Speeches*, XVI, 580-581.

to fulfil or to annul the Constitution. Webster chose to risk his reputation; the extreme abolitionists, to risk the Union. Webster felt, as his opponents later recognized, that "the habitual cherishing of the principle", "resistance to unjust laws is obedience to God", threatened the Constitution. "He . . . addressed himself, therefore, to the duty of calling the American people back from revolutionary theories to . . . submission to authority."⁷⁶ As in 1830 against Haynes, so in 1850 against Calhoun and disunion, Webster stood not as "a Massachusetts man, but as an American", for "the preservation of the Union".⁷⁷ In both speeches he held that he was acting not for Massachusetts, but for the "whole country" (1830), "the good of the whole" (1850). His devotion to the Union and his intellectual balance led him to reject the impatience, bitterness, and disunion sentiments of abolitionists and secessionists. "We must wait for the slow progress of moral causes", a doctrine already announced in 1840, he reiterated in 1850.⁷⁸

The earlier accounts of Webster as losing his friends are at variance with the facts. Cautious Northerners naturally hesitated to support him and face both the popular convictions on fugitive slaves and the rasping vituperation that exhausted sacred and profane history in the epithets current in that "era of warm journalistic manners"; Abolitionists and Free Soilers congratulated one another that they had "killed Webster". In Congress no Northern man save Ashmun of Massachusetts supported him in any speech for months. On the other hand, Webster did retain the friendship and confidence of leaders and common men North and South, and the tremendous influence of his personality and "unanswerable" arguments eventually swung the North for the Compromise. From Boston came prompt expressions of "entire concurrence" in his speech by 800 representative men, including George Ticknor, William H. Prescott, Rufus Choate, Josiah Quincy, President Sparks and Professor Felton of Harvard, Professors Woods, Stuart, and Emerson of Andover, and other leading professional, literary, and business men. Similar addresses were sent to him from about the same number of men in New York, from supporters in Newburyport, Medford, Kennebeck River, Philadelphia, the Detroit Common Council, Manchester, New Hampshire, and "the neighbors" in Salisbury. His old Boston Congressional district triumphantly elected Eliot, one of Webster's most loyal supporters, by a vote of 2,355 against 473 for Charles Sumner. The Massachusetts legislature overwhelmingly defeated a proposal to

⁷⁶ Seward, *Works*, III. 111-116.

⁷⁷ *Writings and Speeches*, X. 57, 97.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, XIII. 595; X. 65.

instruct Webster to vote for the Wilmot Proviso. Scores of unpublished letters in the New Hampshire Historical Society and the Library of Congress reveal hearty approval from both parties and all sections. Winthrop of Massachusetts, too cautious to endorse Webster's entire position, wrote to the governor of Massachusetts that as a result of the speech, "disunion stock is already below par".⁷⁹ "You have performed the responsible duties of a national Senator", wrote General Dearborn. "I thank you because you did not speak upon the subject as a Massachusetts man", said Reverend Thomas Worcester of Boston, an overseer of Harvard. "Your speech has saved the Union", was the verdict of Barker of Pennsylvania, a man not of Webster's party.⁸⁰ "The Union threatened . . . you have come to the rescue, and all disinterested lovers of that Union must rally round you", wrote Wainwright of New York. In Alabama, Reverend J. W. Allen recognized the "comprehensive and self-forgetting spirit of patriotism" in Webster, "which, if followed, would save the Union, unite the country and prevent the danger in the Nashville Convention". Like approval of Webster's "patriotic stand for the preservation of the Union" was sent from Green County and Greensboro in Alabama and from Tennessee and Virginia.⁸¹ "The preservation of the Union is the only safety-valve. On Webster depends the tranquility of the country", says an anonymous writer from Charleston, a native of Massachusetts and former pupil of Webster.⁸² Poinsett and Francis Lieber, South Carolina Unionists, expressed like views.⁸³ The growing influence of the speech is testified to in letters from all sections. Linus Child of Lowell finds it modifying his own previous opinions and believes that "shortly if not at this moment, it will be approved by a large majority of the people of Massachusetts".⁸⁴ "Upon sober second thought, our people will generally coincide with your views", wrote ex-Governor and ex-Mayor Armstrong of Boston.⁸⁵ "Every day adds to the number of those who agree with you", is the confirmatory testimony of Dana, trustee of Andover and former president of Dartmouth.⁸⁶ "The effect of your speech begins to be felt", wrote ex-Mayor Eliot of Boston.⁸⁷ Mayor Huntington

⁷⁹ Mar. 10. MS., "Private", to Governor Clifford.

⁸⁰ Mar. 11, Apr. 13. Webster papers, N. H. Hist. Soc., cited hereafter as "N. H.".

⁸¹ Mar. 11, 25, 22, 17, 26, 28. Greenough Collection.

⁸² May 20. N.H.

⁸³ Apr. 19, May 4. N.H.

⁸⁴ Apr. 1. Greenough.

⁸⁵ *Writings and Speeches*, XVIII. 357.

⁸⁶ Apr. 19. N.H.

⁸⁷ June 12. N.H. Garrison childishly printed Eliot's name upside down, and between black lines, *Liberator*, Sept. 20.

of Salem at first felt the speech to be too Southern; but "subsequent events at North and South have entirely satisfied me that you were right . . . and vast numbers of others here in Massachusetts were wrong". "The change going on in me has been going on all around me." "You saw farther ahead than the rest or most of us and had the courage and patriotism to stand upon the true ground."⁸⁸ This significant inedited letter is but a specimen of the change of attitude manifested in hundreds of letters from "slow and cautious Whigs".⁸⁹ One of these, Edward Everett, unable to accept Webster's attitude on Texas and the fugitive slave bill, could not "entirely concur" in the Boston letter of approval. "I think our friend will be able to carry the weight of it at home, but as much as ever." "It would, as you justly said," he wrote Winthrop, "have ruined any other man." This probably gives the position taken at first by a good many moderate anti-slavery men. Everett's later attitude is likewise typical of a change in New England. He wrote in 1851 that Webster's speech "more than any other cause, contributed to avert the catastrophe", and was "a practical basis for the adjustment of controversies, which had already gone far to dissolve the Union".⁹⁰

Isaac Hill, a bitter New Hampshire political opponent, confesses that Webster's "kindly answer" to Calhoun was wiser than his own might have been. Hill, an experienced political observer, had feared in the month preceding Webster's speech a "disruption of the Union" with "no chance of escaping a conflict of blood". He felt that the censures of Webster were undeserved, that Webster was not merely right, but he had "power he can exercise at the North, beyond any other man", and that "all that is of value will declare in favor of the great principles of your late Union speech".⁹¹ "Its tranquilizing effect upon public opinion has been wonderful"; "it has almost the unanimous support of this community", wrote the New York philanthropist Minturn.⁹² "The speech made a powerful impression in this state. . . . Men feel they can stand on it with security."⁹³ In Cincinnati, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Pittsfield (with only one exception) the speech was found "wise and patriotic".⁹⁴ The sender of a resolution of approval from the grand jury of the

⁸⁸ Dec. 13. N.H.

⁸⁹ *Writings and Speeches*, XVI. 582.

⁹⁰ Winthrop MSS., Mar. 21 and Apr. 10, 1850, Nov. 1851; Curtis, *Life*, II. 580; Everett's *Memoir*; Webster's *Works* (1851), I. clvii.

⁹¹ Apr. 17, 10 Webster. *Liberator*, Dec. 27, 1850, May 8, 1856. Curtis, *Life*, II. 429 n.

⁹² Apr. 4. N.H.

⁹³ Barnard, Albany, Apr. 19. N.H.

⁹⁴ Mar. 15, 28. N.H.

United States court at Indianapolis says that such judgment is almost universal.⁹⁵ "It is thought you may save the country . . . you may keep us still united", wrote Thornton of Memphis, who soberly records the feeling of thoughtful men that the Southern purpose of disunion was stronger than appeared in either newspapers or political gatherings.⁹⁶ "Your speech has disarmed—has quieted the South;⁹⁷ has rendered invaluable service to the harmony and union of the South and the North".⁹⁸ "I am confident of the higher approbation, not of a single section of the Union, but of all sections", wrote a political opponent in Washington.⁹⁹

The influence of Webster in checking the radical purposes of the Nashville Convention has been shown above.¹⁰⁰

All classes of men from all sections show a substantial and growing backing of Webster's 7th of March speech as "the only statesmanlike and practicable way to save the Union". "To you, more than to any other statesman of modern times, do the people of this country owe their national feeling which we trust is to save this Union in this its hour of trial", was the judgment of "the neighbors", the plain farmers of Webster's old New Hampshire home.¹⁰¹ Outside of the Abolition and Free Soil press, the growing tendency in newspapers, like that of their readers, was to support Webster's logical position.¹⁰²

Exaggerated though some of these expressions of approval may have been, they balance the exaggerated vituperation of Webster in the anti-slavery press; and the extremes of approval and disapproval both concur in recognizing the widespread effect of the speech, "No speech ever delivered in Congress produced . . . so beneficial a change of opinion. The change of feeling and temperament wrought in Congress by this speech is miraculous."¹⁰³

The contemporary testimony to Webster's checking of disunion is substantiated by the conclusions of Petigru of South Carolina, Cobb of Georgia in 1852, Allen of Pennsylvania in 1853, and by Stephens's mature judgment of "the profound sensation upon the

⁹⁵ June 10. Greenough.

⁹⁶ Mar. 28. Greenough.

⁹⁷ H. I. Anderson, Tenn., Apr. 8. Greenough.

⁹⁸ Nelson, Va., May 2. N.H.

⁹⁹ Mar. 8. Greenough.

¹⁰⁰ Pp. 255-256.

¹⁰¹ August, 1850; 127 signatures. N.H.

¹⁰² Ogg, *Webster*, p. 379; Rhodes, I. 157-158.

¹⁰³ *New York Journal of Commerce*, *Boston Advertiser*, *Richmond Whig*, Mar. 12; *Baltimore Sun*, Mar. 18; Ames, *Calhoun*, p. 25; *Boston Watchman and Reflector*, in *Liberator*, Apr. 1.

public mind throughout the Union made by Webster's 7th of March speech. The friends of the Union under the Constitution were strengthened in their hopes and inspired with renewed energies."¹⁰⁴ In 1874 Foote wrote, "The speech produced beneficial effects everywhere. His statement of facts was generally looked upon as unanswerable; his argumentative conclusions appeared to be inevitable; his conciliatory tone . . . softened the sensibilities of all patriots."¹⁰⁵ "He seems to have gauged more accurately [than most] the grave dangers which threatened the republic and . . . the fearful consequences which must follow its disruption", was Henry Wilson's later and wiser judgment.¹⁰⁶ "The general judgment," said Senator Hoar in 1899, "seems to be coming to the conclusion that Webster differed from the friends of freedom of his time not in a weaker moral sense, but only in a larger, and profounder prophetic vision." "He saw what no other man saw, the certainty of civil war. I was one of those who . . . judged him severely, but I have learned better." "I think of him now . . . as the orator who bound fast with indissoluble strength the bonds of union."¹⁰⁷

Modern writers, North and South—Garrison, Chadwick, T. C. Smith, Merriam, for instance¹⁰⁸—now recognize the menace of disunion in 1850 and the service of Webster in defending the Union. Rhodes, though condemning Webster's support of the fugitive slave bill, recognizes that the speech was one of the few that really altered public opinion and won necessary Northern support for the Compromise. "We see now that in the War of the Rebellion his principles were mightier than those of Garrison." "It was not the Liberty or Abolitionist party, but the Union party that won."¹⁰⁹

Postponement of secession for ten years gave the North preponderance in population, voting power, production, and transportation, new party organization, and convictions which made man-power and economic resources effective. The Northern lead of four million people in 1850 had increased to seven millions by 1860. In 1850, each section had thirty votes in the Senate; in 1860, the North had a majority of six, due to the admission of California, Oregon, and Minnesota. In the House of Representatives, the North had added seven to her majority. The Union states and territories built during

¹⁰⁴ *War between the States*, II, 211.

¹⁰⁵ *Civil War* (1866), pp. 130-131.

¹⁰⁶ *Slave Power*, II, 246.

¹⁰⁷ *Scribner's Magazine*, XXVI, 84.

¹⁰⁸ Garrison, *Westward Expansion*, pp. 327-332; Chadwick, *The Causes of the Civil War*, pp. 49-51; Smith, *Parties and Slavery*, p. 9; Merriam, *Life of Bowles*, I, 81.

¹⁰⁹ Rhodes, I, 157, 161.

the decade 15,000 miles of railroad, to 7,000 or 8,000 in the eleven seceding states. In shipping, the North in 1860 built about 800 vessels to the seceding states' 200. In 1860, in the eleven most important industries for war, Chadwick estimates that the Union states produced \$735,500,000; the seceding states \$75,250,000, "a manufacturing productivity eleven times as great for the North as for the South".¹¹⁰ In general, during the decade, the census figures for 1860 show that since 1850 the North had increased its man-power, transportation, and economic production from two to fifty times as fast as the South, and that in 1860 the Union states were from two to twelve times as powerful as the seceding states.

Possibly Southern secessionists and Northern abolitionists had some basis for thinking that the North would let the "erring sisters depart in peace" in 1850. Within the next ten years, however, there came a decisive change. The North, exasperated by the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, the high-handed acts of Southerners in Kansas in 1856, and the Dred Scott *dictum* of the Supreme Court in 1857, felt that these things amounted to a repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the opening up of the territory to slavery. In 1860 Northern conviction, backed by an effective, thorough party platform on a Union basis, swept the free states. In 1850, it was a "Constitutional Union" party that accepted the Compromise and arrested secession in the South; and Webster, foreseeing a "remodelling of parties", had prophesied that "there must be a Union party".¹¹¹ Webster's spirit and speeches and his strengthening of federal power through Supreme Court cases won by his arguments had helped to furnish the conviction which underlay the Union Party of 1860 and 1864. His consistent opposition to nullification and secession, and his appeal to the Union and to the Constitution during twenty years preceding the Civil War—from his reply to Hayne to his seventh of March speech—had developed a spirit capable of making economic and political power effective. Men inclined to sneer at Webster for his interest in manufacturing, farming, and material prosperity, may well remember that in his mind, and more slowly in the minds of the North, economic progress went hand in hand with the development of union and of liberty secured by law.

Whether we look to the material progress of the North from 1850 to 1860 or to its development in "imponderables", Webster's policy and his power over men's thoughts and deeds were essential factors in the ultimate triumph of the Union, which would have been at least

¹¹⁰ *Preliminary Report*, Eighth Census, 1860; Chadwick, *Causes of the Civil War*, p. 28.

¹¹¹ Oct. 2, 1850. *Writings and Speeches*, XVI. 368-369.

dubious had secession been attempted in 1850. It was a soldier, not the modern orator, who said that "Webster shotted our guns". A letter to Senator Hoar from another Union soldier says that he kept up his heart as he paced up and down as sentinel in an exposed place by repeating over and over, "Liberty and Union now and forever, one and inseparable".¹¹² Hosmer tells us that he and his boyhood friends of the North in 1861 "did not argue much the question of the right of secession", but that it was the words of Webster's speeches, "as familiar to us as the sentences of the Lord's prayer and scarcely less consecrated, . . . with which we sprang to battle". Those boys were not ready in 1850. The decisive human factors in the Civil War were the men bred on the profound devotion to the Union which Webster shared with others equally patriotic, but less profoundly logical, less able to mould public opinion. Webster not only saw the vision himself; he had the genius to make the plain American citizen see that liberty could come through union and not through disunion. Moreover, there was in Webster and the Compromise of 1850 a spirit of conciliation, and therefore there was on the part of the North a belief that they had given the South a "square deal", and a corresponding indignation at the attempts in the next decade to expand slavery by violating the Compromises of 1820 and 1850. So, by 1860, the decisive border states and Northwest were ready to stand behind the Union. Lincoln, born in a border state and bred in the Northwest, and on Webster's doctrine, "the Union is paramount", when he accepted the Republican platform in 1864 summed up the issues of the long struggle in Webster's words of 1830, repeated in briefer form in the 7th of March speech, "Liberty and Union".¹¹³

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

¹¹² *Scribner*, XXVI. 84; *American Law Review*, XXXV. 804.

¹¹³ Nicolay and Hay, IX. 76.

DOCUMENTS

Washington in 1834; Letter of Robert C. Caldwell

THE following letter, presenting an entertaining picture of Washington in 1834 and some interesting glimpses of President Jackson, was written by Robert C. Caldwell to his father, Colonel Samuel Caldwell, of Franklin, Ohio. For the opportunity to print it we are indebted to Professor George M. Whicher, of Hunter College, New York City, whose great-grandmother was in 1834 the wife of Colonel Caldwell. This lady, born Margaret Patterson, was thrice married. Her first husband was Samuel Venable, of Lexington, Kentucky. This letter passed at her death to her daughter by this first marriage, Mrs. Stephen Whicher (Mary Venable), from whom it descended to Professor Whicher.

The letter is written on a double sheet of paper, 14 by 17 inches in size; the four pages are entirely filled save the small space which was left to be the front and back of the folded letter when ready for mail. There is no sign of direction or postmark, or indication of the postage, from which it may be inferred that the letter was transmitted by some friend.

Colonel Samuel Caldwell, a proprietor in Franklin before 1810, and holder of various offices in its early days, was a state senator of Ohio in 1824, 1825, 1828, and 1829, and at the time when the letter was written was an associate judge of the court of common pleas for Warren County.¹ Robert C. Caldwell was appointed second lieutenant in the Marine Corps October 17, 1834, first lieutenant March 3, 1845, and died November 13, 1852.

WASHINGTON CITY 29th Dec. 1834

Dear Father,

Probably you think long by this time to receive a letter from me and as I have an abundance of leisure whenever I choose to curtail my curiosity and confine myself to my room, I have concluded to write you and try if I can fill, in such measure as to be interesting to you, this mammoth sheet. Well I have seen a great many new things and great men, since I came here, but before I proceed to tell you about them you must first hear how I arrived here and when.—I wrote you 'ast as I was about to leave Cin.² on Wednesday the 3rd inst. Arrived safely

¹ *History of Warren County, Ohio* (Chicago, 1882), pp. 423, 424, 427, 519-521, 550.

² Cincinnati.

on Saturday at 10 o'clock P. M. at Wheeling. Took stage next morning at 10 o'clock and arrived (via Washington, Brownsville, Union,³ Cumberland and Hagerstown) at Fredericktown⁴ on Tuesday evening at 4 o'clock. Next morning took the rail-road to Baltimore, 60 miles, and arrived at Balt. early in the evening having traveled at the rate of 15 miles per hour, part of the way by horse-power and part by steam. Almost all the towns from Wheeling to Baltimore are flourishing inland towns, and Frederic especially. Balt. is a curious city—the Monumental City. Among its curiosities are the Washington Monument—the battle monument, the public fountains—the shot towers—the Cathedral—and the shipping.—The Washington Monument is built of white marble and is 180 feet in height. I ascended it and had a bird's eye view of all the city—and the prospect over the surrounding country and far, far down the bay is very delightful. The shipping, consisting of Frigates, Brigs, Schooners, Sloops and what not, some sailing up and some sailing down the bay, moving with the fleetness of birds and as if by some magic influence, contrasts very happily with the vessels at the wharf, which with their masts and yards all stripped of their sails, look like a deadened forest on the beach. These, you know, were the first vessels I had ever seen with a mast and sails.

Well, the Cathedral I cannot pretend to describe particularly; it is the Roman Cath. church and is the largest in America—is filled with splendid and curious paintings and as a curiosity is a considerable source of revenue to the church, as they charge 25 cents for every person who visits it.—The shot towers are merely great tall cones built of brick, immensely high. The public fountains are merely natural springs, very large and strong, which have, for the convenience of the city, been walled up with hewn stone, and very handsomely adorned. There are some three or four of them.

On the 12th, passed from Balt. here, by stage in 5 hours, distance 40 miles—arrived here at 2 o'clock on Friday the 12 inst.—put up at Brown's Hotel⁵—boarding \$1.25 per day—dear enough, but 25 cents per day cheaper than Gadsby's.⁶ On the 17th found a genteel and comfortable boarding-house at \$1.00 per day a few doors from Brown's on the opposite side of Pa. Avenue and removed to it, where I now am writing this letter.—But to return a little. On my arrival, found Taylor Webster and Gen. Taylor of Newport⁷ boarding at the same house, made my arrival known to them soon and they treat me with great friendship and politeness. I get into my own room and all things arranged; I overhaul my letters of Introduction. Find among the most

³ Uniontown, Pa.

⁴ Frederick, Md.

⁵ The Indian Queen Hotel, kept by Jesse Brown, on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between Sixth and Seventh streets.

⁶ The National Hotel, Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street.

⁷ Gen. James Taylor (1750-1848), of Newport, Ky., quartermaster general of Hull's forces in 1812, and in 1834 probably the largest landed proprietor in the Ohio Valley. Lewis Collins, *History of Kentucky* (second ed., Covington, 1882), pp. 114-115. He was a first cousin of Col. Richard Taylor, Zachary Taylor's father. A. R. Watson, *Some Notable Families of America* (New York, 1898), p. 19. See also *American Historical Register*, I. 57-58.

prominent of them Micajah T.⁸ to Martin Van B. So off I goes at a proper hour in the day to call upon the Gen.—find him in—he receives me with a hearty welcome and presents me by letter to the Prest.—where, calling, I meet Maj. Donaldson⁹ who reads Mr. Whitchers¹⁰ letter and leads me in and introduces me, in propria persona, to Gen. Jackson. I see no change in the Gen since I saw him in Cin.¹¹—he received me very cordially indeed—in company with him I found Amos Kendal and Bell of Tennessee, Speaker of the House,¹² and two or three others, to all of whom I was cordially introduced and then invited to sit and spend the evening in familiar chit-chat which of course I did.—dispersed at a seasonable hour with an invitation to take a family dinner with the Prest. and Maj. D. and family on a specified day, which invitation I of course accepted.

Well the day came round, and 3 o'clock, the dining hour, found me introduced into the anti-chamber along with Col. ——— (somebody, I've forgotten his name) and Col. ——— somebody else, whose name I cannot call either, and presently the Maj. D. and the Prest. entered and there we sat some 15 minutes or so chatting, when the Porter informed the Maj. dinner was ready—lead by the porter we passed out of the Anti-chamber, through a spacious Hall and entered another very finely furnished room which was darkened by the window-curtains and blinds, and contained two tables richly laden with fine plate and dishes and tall splendid lamps burning on either table—around one table were the chairs which showed that that was the one at which we were to sit—so we were seated—what attracted my attention first was the very nicely folded Knapkin on each plate, with a slice of good light bread in the middle of it.—Well, all being seated, the Gen. asked a blessing, then the servants about the table, I believe one to every man, commenced—"Will you have some roast beef?—some corn beef?—some boiled beef?—some beef stake?"¹³

Well, the beef being through with, away goes your plate and a clean one comes. "Will you have this kind or that kind or the other kind of fish?" Fish being through, a new plate and then some other dish. Then a new plate and some other dish—then a new plate and the pies—then the desert—then and in the mean time the wines—sherry, madaira, and champagne which are filled into the glasses by the Butler, and then with a significant nod of the head drink one another's health

⁸ Meaning, no doubt, Micajah T. Williams, of Cincinnati, surveyor general for Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan.

⁹ Maj. Andrew Jackson Donelson, the president's wife's nephew. See *American Historical Review*, XXIII, 355-356.

¹⁰ Stephen Whicher had married the writer's half-sister, Mary Venable.

¹¹ Jackson was at Cincinnati, "over one boat", in the preceding summer.

¹² Amos Kendall, fourth auditor of the treasury; John Bell.

¹³ The reader who is struck by the amplitude of the provision may like to compare the grave conversation of Washington's best waiter with Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith over a small dinner to be given, that same winter, to Miss Martineau. "'Yesterday at Mrs. Woodbury's there was only 18 in company and there were 30 dishes of meat'. . . But I carried my point in only having 8 dishes of meat, tho' I could not convince Henry it was more genteel than a grander dinner". *First Forty Years of Washington Society*, pp. 360-362.

—then after so long a time, all of which made very agreeable by miscellaneous conversation we rise from table and retire again to the chamber whence we had come, where being seated and in conversation in high glee, in comes a servant with a dish of coffee for each of us. Well, must drink it of course—so directly aside looking at my watch find it almost 7 o'clock, I conclude it must be time for me to retire. So I takes the Prest. by the hand and says "Gen., I bid you good-night and it will always be my pride to do you honour." Well says the Gen. "You can do it in no way better than by learning your duty and discharging it faithfully. Improve your opportunities and you will no doubt make a first-rate officer." These words the Gen. spoke with an air of characteristic frankness and in the presence of those gentlemen before named, so that I could not but look upon them as very flattering testimonials. With a hearty shake of the hand I bid the Gen. Adieu—then taking leave of the other gentlemen I retired quite gratified at the hospitality and friendship I had reed.

But I find myself rather ahead of my story. Meanwhile between the time that I reed the invitation and eat the dinner, I saw Gen Lipton, H. and E. Hayward, Reynolds, Cass, and Dickerson,¹⁴ of my own Corps Maj. Weed, Col. Henderson, Col. Brown, Adj. Howle, Capt. Twigs [?], Lieut. Tyler and Doct. Kearney—besides several other officers of different grades whose names (except Gen Jesup and Col. Craughan)¹⁵ I cannot pretend to recollect and I expect hardly their faces. Well now for some of the strange things I have seen.

The Capitol. I wish I possessed the faculty of noticing things minutely and then the ability to describe them lucidly and accurately, I would then portray to you this building. It is said that there is not another Edifice in the known world that combines in such sweet proportions, as does this, the excellencies of grandeur, magnificence, superabundance, splendour, beauty and simplicity. It is built of solid white marble blocks, and I think scarcely a wooden floor or step about it—all stone and floors brick. You have frequently seen engravings of it, and probably you may now see somewhere on the walls of the public house you are at the picture hanging; if so it will give you a better idea of the external appearance of the building than I can give you with my pen. The principal front is East—and most splendid it is (but here I begin to meet the difficulty; I cannot describe with any justice; however to make up for the lameness of what I may say and to give you a more perfect idea of the building, I will try to procure and have franked to you, a description by the Architect himself, which you will find mystified by technics, but the most of which you will be able to understand.)¹⁶ I was saying the front east,—and the West;—what

¹⁴ Probably the reference is to Lewis Cass, secretary of war, and Mahlon Dickerson, secretary of the navy. The members of the writer's own corps here mentioned are, apparently, Maj. Elijah J. Weed, quartermaster of the corps, Col. Archibald Henderson, colonel commandant U. S. M. C. 1834-1859, Capt. Parke G. Howle, Capt. Levi Twigg, First Lieut. Henry B. Tyler, and Surgeon John A. Kearney, U. S. N.

¹⁵ Maj.-Gen. Thomas S. Jesup, quartermaster general U. S. A. 1818-1860; Col. George Croghan, inspector general 1825-1849.

¹⁶ *Guide to the Capitol of the United States* (Washington, 1834), "by

is it? Why a front also grand, elegant. The ends North and South are also elegant fronts—the building is four stories including the basement story—this lowest is cut off into rooms and halls chiefly formed by the arches that sustain the superstructure—two of these spacious rooms are devoted to Refectories or Eating houses for the members—towards the close of the session the houses sit from 10 A. M. till 2 A. M. of the following day sometime, and then it is that they make use particularly of these houses—they call for Mutton Soup, or turtle soup, or Oyster Soup, or beef stake or Coffee or tea or rum, just as they choose, and get whatever they call for.—Congress furnishes the keepers with house and fire-wood free of charge and then regulates, by rule, the price of everything, so that they cannot be imposed upon, and one member of the House told me that none but Members were admitted there and another told me anybody who pleases may go and eat if he pays the established fare; so, how that matter stands, exactly, I cannot say, for I have never gone to eat. The second story is divided into rooms and halls—one for the U. S. Court—one for the Library of Congress—then some jury and committee rooms—the third story into rooms for the several standing Committees of both Houses—and the fourth story consists of the Chambers of the two Houses of Congress (i.e.) excepting the central part of the building which consists of but one story from the base of the 2nd story—that is, it is carried up in a circle through all the stories to the very top of the great dome—this is what is called the rotunda which is lit from the top of the Dome, which contains some grand pieces of sculpture and some excellent paintings illustrative of scenes which occurred during the Infancy of the Republic, and principally during the Revolutionary War.¹⁷ These sculptures and paintings are set in niches in the wall, made on purpose to receive them.—A Bronze statue of Jefferson stands out in the floor¹⁸ and two elegant statues lately executed by Persico, a famed Italian Artist, which are set each on a temporary pedestal of wood—one is the representation of the God of War—Mars as the Romans called him—and the other the Goddess of Peace—carved from white (and I suppose Italian) marble—they have been the work of years—the artist is here now; a very swarthy and excessively jovial Italian—he takes great pride in brushing them up and keeping them in complete order. I have not yet learned what Congress is to give him for the work, but have no doubt but the sum will be immense.¹⁹

Robert Mills, Engineer and Architect, who however was not architect of the Capitol. That office was abolished in 1829, Charles Bulfinch then retiring; Mills was appointed architect in 1836. The pamphlet is not excessively technical, though it is excessively occupied with the opinions of Mills. The young lieutenant's statements as to the interior arrangements of the Capitol are not always accurate.

¹⁷ Referring to Trumbull's four paintings. The other four are of later execution.

¹⁸ Afterward placed in the grounds of the White House, but now once more in the rotunda of the Capitol.

¹⁹ In 1837 these figures were set up in niches in the east portico; see pl. 117 in Glenn Brown's *History of the United States Capitol* (Washington, 1900), vol. I. Successive appropriation acts, beginning in 1829, show the total pay-

The Library of Congress is one of the interior curiosities which I have not yet had time to examine, but shall take some early opportunity of doing so.—The two chambers, in their internal arrangement, very much resemble the Senate Chamber at Columbus—so much for the inside of the Capitol, now for round about awhile. A lot of probably two acres lies spread out before the East front; very beautifully indeed laid off into walks and flower-beds—it is true at this season of the year the trees and shrubbery and bushes are not loaded with flowers and blossoms and fruit, yet the very mention of them, some of whose names have hardly an existence save in some poetic or classical association—I say the very mention of the names of these rare exotics has a tendency to stir up the imagination to painting of all their gay decorations—all sorts and varieties of evergreens etc. etc. etc.—Directly in front of the Central door of the Capitol is a fish-pond—it is of oval shape, perhaps 2 rods wide by 3 rods long and some ten or twelve feet deep—paved in the bottom with hewn stone and built up around of the same material—then a few bushels of beautiful clean gravel thrown in—the water as clear as crystal and a beautiful cerulean blue—then caged in this miniature sea are great varieties of little fish—this pond is fenced round with an iron railing.²⁰ Near the top of the stone wall you can discover an orifice of perhaps thirty square inches, through which the water flows toward the Capitol, but you see it no more till you come round to the entrance of the basement story on the West, where, right in front of the very entrance it gushes out of a rich marble fountain, made for the purpose, into a large marble bowl which sits on a marble pedestal, a convenient high for one to wash at. From this fountain, overflowing the bowl, it runs through a smooth, square gutter cut in rock for perhaps two rods, then falls with the continued roar of a miniature cataract into another fish-pond, just like the last excepting that it is square, instead of oval. Right in the Centre of this pool of water stands what is currently denominated "the Naval Monument".²¹ It is built chiefly of white marble, but, as I cannot command the technic's of the Sculptor's Art, I cannot pretend to give you a picture of this curiosity. I can, however, tell by whom erected and for what purpose, which I do by telling you what is engraved on its several squares. On the East side are written, in the marble, these words: (viz) "Erected to the memory of Capt. Richard Somers, Lieutenants James Caldwell, James Decatur, Henry Wadsworth, Joseph Israel and John Dorsey who fell in the different attacks that were made on the city of Tripoli in the year of our Lord 1804 and in the 28th year of the Independence of the United States." These words are on the South side; (viz) "The love of Glory inspired them, *Fame* has crowned their deeds, History records the event, the children of Columbia admire, and Commerce laments their fall." On the North

ment to have been \$24,000. The signing of the contract was Adams's last action as president; *Memoirs*, VIII, 104, 123. Luigi Persico was a Neapolitan artist who had lived in Lancaster, Philadelphia, and elsewhere in America since 1819. W. U. Hensel, *An Italian Artist in Old Lancaster* (Lancaster, 1912); *Works of James Buchanan*, III, 56-59.

²⁰ See pl. 90 in Glenn Brown, *op. cit.*

²¹ Now in Annapolis. See pl. 89, *ibid.*

Side, these words; (viz) "As a small tribute of respect to their memory, and of admiration of their valor, so worthy of imitation, their brother Officers have erected this Monument." So you see I am not the first Caldwell that ever entered the American Navy. Who this namesake was, by blood and origin, I know not,²² but the name he has already immortalized, and here it stands, imperishable as the marble. Well, so be it. I covet not the glory of any man, nor do I feel disposed to boast vainly; but I frankly declare this, that it is my determination to *deserve* promotion, if in my power; and to *obtain* it as speedily as possible. And if, as circumstances, of which I shall presently speak, seem to indicate, it is my lot to have been thrown into the Navy in just the nick of time, when we may have some active defense of our rights to make, be assured your name shall not be disgraced, nor your memory dishonoured, by the cowardice of one who holds both *sacred*. My temper is pacific, my voice is still for peace; but should circumstances in our national affairs bring about a war, I shall be responsible only for the *result*. If I die, it shall be at my post.—But hold! my pen seems given to digressions—we will have a word or two about the French War hereafter. I will now return to my story.

The President's House is the next curiosity. It is built very much in external appearance like the Capitol excepting the Domes—and excepting that, although an immensely large house, it is small compared to the Capitol—it is a Capitol in miniature—and all that I can say of it is, that in the inside it seems to a stranger to be curiously arranged, so much so that he might with ease get lost in it. It is most richly and elegantly furnished, and comes up to my idea of a Royal Palace. On the outside it is commanding and magnificently grand. The yard and grounds around it are gratefully and gracefully adorned with trees, shrubbery, grass borders and walks. The Palace stands in the center of probably a ten acre lot and fronts North and south. On the east and west ends of the ten acre lot, or "President's square" as it is called, stand the four departments of State, Treasury, War and Navy.²³ (The Treasury building was burned down, you remember, but its place is here yet.) These buildings are very spacious—built of brick—rather antiquated in appearance. But I will tire myself and weary you if I continue dwelling on the minutiae of things. Suffice it for this part of my story, to say that the whole "square" is enclosed with an iron railing fence, or something so much like it that one might readily be deceived, and the whole concern together looks as if it might be the Manor of some such Nabob as Uncle Sam. The City of Washington is curiously laid out; but if you have ever seen a map of it, you will have a better idea of it than I can give you with my pen. However,

²² James R. Caldwell, of Pennsylvania, first lieutenant of the *Siren*, killed Aug. 7, 1804, in one of the gunboat attacks on Tripoli. Goldsborough, *U. S. Naval Chronicle*, p. 227.

²³ The building of the State Department, and south of it that of the Treasury Department, stood at the east of the White House, approximately where the Treasury now stands; the building of the War Department, and south of it that of the Navy Department, at the west, about where now stands the State, War, and Navy Building. The allusion in the next sentence is to the fire of 1833.

this much I can say (viz) There is a set of streets they call Avenues, that all commence at the center of the Capitol and radiate to every point, $\frac{1}{2}$ point, and $\frac{1}{4}$ point of the Compass, another set that commence at the center of the Prest's House and radiate in the same way and then in addition to these the town is laid out in the old checquer-board style with streets crossing each other at right angles—So that from the Capitol or from the Prest's House you may go straight in whatever direction you please.

I have not yet taken an opportunity to examine the curiosities in the Patent Office or the office of the War Dep. where I am told there are some to be seen. Also in the Dep. of State—the Prest's H.—The curiosity one feels at first to hear the great men of the Nation make their speeches in Congress, I find soon wears off. Clay is very calm as yet and rather sulky. Webster says but little, but is expected to loom forth some of these days on the French claims previous to 1800. J. Q. Adams has not spent much breath yet this session; I suppose he has been condensing for the purpose of making a great blow on the 31st in honour of the memory of the great and good Lafayette.²⁴ I expect that to be an occasion of interest and anticipate it with great pleasure. So much of the Prest's Message as refers to the French treaty is quite obnoxious to the blue-lights.²⁵ I believe it is referred to the Com. on Foreign Affairs, of which I think Clay is Chairman and he is expected to make his home thrust from that quarter. Some of the knowing ones seem to think and talk as if a war is inevitable, others say they cannot predict the issue, but there is only one path for them and that is to sustain the Executive in his proposed measures; better incur, say they, the expence, the difficulties and losses of a war than suffer the honour of the American nation to be tarnished (and by the way let me tell you, the Navy officers here, almost to a man, are hoping and praying for War). The event of the matter, I think however, will probably be that Congress will fight the battle themselves in the Capitol and save the French Nation and the American Navy the trouble.

Well, (to strike off onto something new,) you do not expect that I have learned much yet about my duty as Lieut. or about the strength or condition of the American Navy, but being here, every day less or more, associating with Officers and men conversant with the service I could not avoid learning something. And I am perfectly astonished to learn how very *limited* is our navy, both in ships and men. The whole number of vessels in commission at present is only nineteen, as follows, 1 ship of the line!, 4 Frigates, 8 sloops of war, and 6 schooners!!! A mighty force indeed! Well, the whole force of men in the Navy proper, including Commissioned and Warrant Officers and seamen and boys and every kind of creature is only 6,072. That of the Marine Corps is only 1283, making in all 7355.²⁶ When from this force you deduct

²⁴ Lafayette died May 20, 1834. At the request of both houses of Congress, Adams delivered before them, on Dec. 31, 1834, an oration on Lafayette, printed in various editions. *Memoirs*, IX, 151-155, 196.

²⁵ Federalists, here no doubt meaning, opponents of Jackson.

²⁶ All these figures agree with, and were doubtless taken from, the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy communicated to Congress by the President on Dec. 2. *American State Papers, Naval Affairs*, IV, 580-590.

the ineffective part of the force you have but a small remnant left to contend with the thousands and thousands of the French Navy, for instance. We have but seven Navy yards, which are strewn along the coast as follows: Portsmouth, Boston, New York, Phila., Washington, Norfolk, and Pensacola. The different stations or squadrons into which our Navy is divided are as follows: 1 The Mediterranean, 2 The West Indian, 3 The Brazilian, 4 The Pacific and East Indian. Thus scattered over the world for the purpose of more advantageously protecting our widely extended commerce—and by the way our widely extended commerce would afford our nation the means of very suddenly increasing her navy, in the event of a war, for, in addition to the 13 naval vessels that are now in ordinary, (i.e.) laid up for repair, and the 13 that are in building, all of which would be speedily made ready for the sea, the Government could purchase Merchant Briggs and fit them out with guns, at comparatively trifling expense to almost any amount that any possible emergency could require, and that in a very short time.

Col. Henderson I find to be a very plain and familiar man, entirely easy in his manners and very gentlemanly in his friendship,—has nothing of the cold and withering frost of ceremony about him. Being very favorably presented to him he told me that I might remain here until I was satisfied and then let him know whenever I was ready for orders, and he would send me to Norfolk, Phila., N. Y., or Boston, just as I would choose. Here then is the question for me. I have considered the matter myself and obtained all the information I could about the several stations, and think of preferring Boston.²⁷ Will probably leave here about the 5th or 8th of Jan. '35.

I will tell you in full the course I have been cutting out for myself in imagination; it is this: to spend the remainder of the present winter in Boston, perhaps till May next—then receive orders to join a vessel in the Pacific station for a 3 years cruise, during which I will circumnavigate the Globe, then in the spring of '38 return to the U. S., spend the summer on leave of absence among my friends in the West so as to rejoin again for a season the family circle and around the fireside and home of my youth to communicate to my dear parents and the family the result of these three years absence and experience in this strange world.—The summer being ended to rejoin the service and be sent out early in the fall on an other three years cruise to the Mediterranean station—then returning in the fall of 1841 to the U. S., resign my commission and retire to some sequestered spot and spend the remainder of my days in the sweet and peaceful enjoyment of the tranquilities of private life. But in the meantime during this 7 years of service it will be my fixed determination to give my leisure hours to Scientific research and especially to the thorough acquirement of the Profession of the Law—which, yes all of which, I will have abundance of leisure to do and almost equal advantages with those I would enjoy were I stationed all the while on land and in our own country.

I will submit my plan to Judge McLane²⁸ and get his advice as

²⁷ The *Official Register* for 1835 and the *Naval Register* for January, 1836, show the writer stationed at Boston (Charlestown).

²⁸ John McLan, of Ohio, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States 1829-1861.

to what library I ought to possess myself of both in reference to the particular study of the Law and to general scientific research.

The almost numberless islands of the Pacific and Indian Oceans at which it will probably be my privilege to touch on this cruise, abound you know with things at once curious and useful—and a communication of the knowledge of which might at the same time be a positive and valuable acquisition to the scientific intelligence of this country, and perhaps a source of pecuniary profit to myself—for “of the making of books”, you know, “there is no end”.—I also intend proposing my plan to Col. Henderson and if I can do it in a proper way I think there will be no doubt but he will favour my views and wishes, and give me orders to those differant stations. I find that there is a great deal to be gained by being in favour with the powers that be—there is a good deal of shuffling in the rank, a good deal of favouritism.

I know not what I ought to fill the remaining blank with that would be of most interest to you. I know of no political news nor of anything specially interesting from Congress. You see the journals as reported in the several papers of the city. Perhaps it will be amusing to describe to you what will be my uniform as Lieut. of Marines. Cap—bell-crown, black leather varnished, mounted with brass scales, brass eagle, black cockade and yellow pompons. Coat—grass green cloth, double breasted, two rows guilt, convex, with eagle, anchor and stars, raised border buttons, ten in each row; standing collar, edged with buff, two loops and buttons on collar of gold lace,—skirt to extend nearly to the bend of the knee, with two large buttons at the waist and gold embroidered shell and flame at the bottom of the skirt; breast to be lined with buff and other small items of ornament so as to make it look splendid. Epaulettes one on each shoulder, of bright gold bullion $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches long and somewhat less than $\frac{1}{2}$ inch diameter, plain gold lace strap, solid crescent, the letters M. C. to be embroidered or of silver within the crescent. Trousers from 15 Oct till 30 April, light grey cloth with buff cloth stripe down the outer seam $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide and welted on the edges. From 1st May till 14 Oct., white linen drilling, plain and spotless. Sword—brass scabbard sword with a mamaluke hilt of white ivory, extreme length of sword 3 feet $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch, curve of blade $\frac{1}{2}$ inch only, so as to be used for cut or thrust, the hilt (included in extreme length) $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches, width of scabbard $1\frac{7}{8}$ inches, width of blade 1 inch. Sword-knot, crimson and gold with bullion tassel. Sword belt of white leather, $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide etc. Sash crimson silk net, with bullion fringe ends, to go twice round the waist and tie on the left hip; the pendant part to be one foot from the tie. Stock black bombasin, white gloves, etc. Boots worn under pants. This is for dress or parade uniform; then we have a frock coat, grass green cloth, single breasted, with ten large marine buttons down the front, two small marine buttons at cuffs, plain stand up collar, lining buff. And then [a] calash, “sort a” fatigue cap. The general opinion of the uniform is that it could not well be much more splendid than it is. All this is quite right—the Nation is opulent—the service is honorable and the uniform ought to be of the first respectability.

About my business with Mrs. Long. I would like to hear, if you have learned anything new, or how she likes the leaving of the notes

in the Bk. I think of course that I must insist on the payment of the face of the notes. As soon as any money is paid in, I wish to invest it in some profitable stock, if I could be advised. You cannot probably receive this letter before I leave this city, but please write me immediately to Boston on the receipt of this letter. Let me know all about your winter arrangements and how Jas. is contented at home when John and I are both away,—how he is like [to] progress with brother McDill. I hope he will think of nothing short of a thorough liberal education; as I know it is your wish to give it to him and as I know it will be of more value to him than many times the amount of treasure it will cost to procure it. My love to him always. Give my best love to Mother²⁹ and tell her that so soon as I can equip myself cap apie, and can meet with a gifted and liberal artist, I will have a full length portrait of the soldier drawn and send it home for a family piece, which will grace her parlour better than the face I gave her. I hear nothing of Robt Welsh,³⁰ but suppose of course he has sailed long ago for the West Indies as his letters led us to expect before I left home. We had a fall of snow 3 or 4 days ago which had not all gone off last night, when it commenced snowing again and has continued without interruption to-day until now 5 o'clock P. M. The weather has not been cold; but I expect after this that I shall have a cold ride to Boston and have it cold when I get there. But wrap in furs will be the remedy.

Your affectionate son,

R. C. CALDWELL.

²⁹ The writer's stepmother.

³⁰ Robert Patterson Welch, son of Mrs. Caldwell by her second husband, Rev. James Welch (d. 1825), entered the naval service as a midshipman Apr. 1, 1828. The *Naval Register* of January, 1835, lists him as on the sloop *St. Louis*, then on the West Indian station.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Evolution of World-Peace. Essays arranged and edited by F. S. MARVIN. [The Unity Series, IV.] (London: Oxford University Press. 1921. Pp. 191. 9s.)

THE campaign for support of the Geneva League of Nations seems to be at once more prolonged and more successful in England than in any other country. The cause has enlisted there the support of intellectuals of many kinds, seasoned statesmen like Mr. Balfour, idealist leaders like Lord Robert Cecil, poetic educators like Gilbert Murray, publicists like Lord Bryce, radio-active reformers like H. G. Wells, and philanthropic uplifters like F. S. Marvin. This latest contribution from Mr. Marvin is the fourth in a series of volumes, each filled with essays by eminent British scholars and each designed to prove some phase of the truth of the title of the first of the series, *The Unity of Western Civilization*.

The lectures in this book, delivered in a summer school at Woodbrooke during August, 1920, are intended for use in study circles connected with the British League of Nations Union. The title here chosen illustrates the belief of Mr. Marvin and his coadjutors that the League of Nations, and the permanent peace toward which it aims, are present products of essential factors in a continuous human experience. That thesis is the text of Mr. Marvin's introductory chapter, the Appeal to History.

In the next chapter, Alexander and Hellenism, Mr. Marvin and Professor Arnold Toynbee, in collaboration, attempt to discover in Alexander's fleeting world-empire, founded on physical force, some sources of later world-unity.

The topic assigned to Sir Paul Vinogradoff is the Work of Rome. He traces in Roman law a progressive tendency to recognize moral obligations and equitable rights, finding therein the basis of the Pax Romana, which "broke down the barriers of internecine hatred, gave a real meaning to the conception of civilized mankind, and made possible an era of prosperity and economic progress". In eighteen pages he devotes but one short paragraph to the influence of the rival world religions in the Empire, and to the fateful victory of Christianity, the religion which preached spiritual unification.

H. W. C. Davis's chapter on Innocent III. and the Mediaeval Church presents the career of that pope as the story of a great failure. He tried to establish the Church as a Christian commonwealth, a veri-

table super-state, embracing all Christians as its constituents and imposing upon all universal peace and obedience, a vision still cherished.

The career of Grotius and the foundation of the modern conception of international law are admirably expounded by G. N. Clark, who inserts a lucid discussion of the theory and practice of neutral commerce and trading with the enemy in the seventeenth century.

G. P. Gooch's subject is the French Revolution as a World Force, a vivid study of the meaning and influence of three doctrines of the Revolution, *viz.* Equality, Popular Sovereignty, and Nationality.

Professor C. R. Beazley sets forth so many of the facts of the Settlement of Vienna, 1814-1815, that he has scarcely any space left for study of the activities and influence of the Quadruple Concert of Europe, the supreme allied council of those days, nor for the confederation of Europe, commonly called the Holy Alliance, which was its league of nations. Considering the purpose of these lectures, it would seem that Professor Beazley has merely glanced at what should have been one of his chief concerns.

Mr. Marvin follows with a sufficiently wide-angled view of International Tendencies in the Nineteenth Century, and Frederick Whelen, in the League in Being, contributes a succinct review of the work of the League down to January, 1921.

H. G. Wells's chapter is called an Apology for a World Utopia, and it is such a demonstration of world salvation by new construction as might be expected from the most imaginative Utopian now living. He points out inevitable differences between American and European outlooks upon world-peace projects. The American lives in a political unity so big that he can go on comfortably for a hundred years before he begins to feel tight in his political skin. European civilization, weakened by race hatreds and language difficulties, cannot go on, "unless the net of boundaries which strangles it is dissolved away". European schools are all teaching patriotism and nationalism, and therefore are "centres of malignant political infection".

The concluding chapter by Eileen Power on the Teaching of History and World Peace again drives home Mr. Wells's last point, but with less lurid language. By Mr. Wells's exciting plea the reader might be persuaded that nowhere except in North America has "the Evolution of World Peace" even begun.

If these well-written essays are to be judged in the light of the title of the book, it must be observed that Mr. Wells alone among these authors seems to have in mind the intimate relation between the evolution of world peace and the necessary unities of modern commerce and finance. Moreover, one chapter was needed to exhibit the sequential relations among the modern precursors of the present attempt at world unity—not so much in theory as in practical politics—beginning with the eighteenth-century Balance of Power, dissolving into the Grand

Alliance against Napoleon, succeeded by the Holy Alliance and the Concert of Europe with its German Confederation, which was a league of nations, and finally resolving itself into a Triple Alliance and Triple Entente, measuring each other behind Hague Conferences. Mr. Marvin's chapter on modern international tendencies barely sets a foot on earth anywhere.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani. Editi ed illustrati da ETTORE PAÍS. [Collezione di Testi e Monumenti Romani, pubblicati da ETTORE PAÍS e da F. STELLA MARANCA.] In two parts. (Rome: A. Nardecchia. 1920. Pp. clxviii, 325; 326-546.)

PROFESSOR PAÍS is one of the most fertile as well as one of the most productive of modern Italian writers in the field of ancient Roman history. He has put out in book form the results of at least nine harvests, he has announced the immediate marketing of four more, and the sturdy growth of yet another four. Nor do these include the one before us.

This volume on the Triumphal Fasti contains an historical introduction of 168 pages, followed by eighteen pages of the epigraphical text of the Fasti, 307 pages of historical comment, and 198 pages of appendixes, corrections, and plates.

Among the eleven appendixes, three are of particular importance. Appendix II. gives the measurements of the walls in which the Fasti are engraved, with a metric determination of the number of lines of *lacunae*. Appendix VII. (pp. 417-471) lists the amounts of booty in gold and silver, both bullion and coin, brought to Rome by the triumphators, and the indemnities levied on conquered nations. As the result of the second Punic War the Carthaginians had to pay Rome 800,000 pounds of silver. Marcus Porcius Cato, when he triumphed over Hither Spain in 194 B.C., brought back 1400 pounds of gold, and over 600,000 pounds of silver. In his triumphs of 46 B.C. alone, Julius Caesar displayed to the people 6500 talents, and 2622 crowns, of gold, a total weight of 20,414 pounds. Appendix XI. lists the sixty-six temples that were erected as a direct result of successful wars.

The 307 pages of historical comment constitute the best part of Professor Païs's work. A test of twenty entries, by comparison with previous publications, showed corrections and additions made with scholarly conservatism, acumen, and care. The lines above each entry which give the Varronian and the Fasti dates, with their unchanged difference of one year, might perhaps be considered redundant.

It is, of course, in the historical introduction that one expects to find the author in his best historical vein, nor is one disappointed. A captious critic might say that it is too long or too discursive, but when he had finished reading it he would be forced to admit that there is

more good and interesting material therein, concerning Roman triumphs, than he could find in any other place.

Recognition of the insecure foundation on which rest some of the earlier notices in the *Fasti*, is basic. The author leaves nothing to be desired in this respect. His treatment of the ceremonies which accompanied the triumphs is an historical essay in itself; the sections on the *ius triumphandi*, *supplicationes*, and *ovatio* are clear and convincing; his examination of the names of the triumphators is illuminating. The patrician Cornelii obtained 25 triumphs, the Valerii 16, the Aemilii 12, the Claudii 7, etc., while the plebeian families, except the Fulvii from Tusculum with 11, and the rich Caecilii Metelli with 9, obtained relatively few. The tabulation of the triumphs outside Italy, 35 over Spain, 13 over Carthage, 11 over Macedonia, 9 over Transalpine Gaul, and the very few over the Orient, shows clearly where Rome found her severest military encounters.

It is to be regretted that the author has not followed a sort of international understanding that Roman proper names are to be given in Latin form. Appio Cieco, Cinoscefale, Azio (Actium), Orazio Coclite (Horatius Cocles), and Giulio Cesare are good examples of this unnecessary Italianization.

Professor Païs has gone to quite too much trouble to explain the reasons for his edition of the *Triumphal Fasti*. It is a fine piece of work, and will be warmly welcomed.

RALPH VANDEMAN MAGOFFIN.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Mesta: a Study in Spanish Economic History, 1273-1836. By JULIUS KLEIN, Assistant Professor of Latin American History and Economics in Harvard University. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1920. Pp. xi, 444. \$4.00.)

THIS is a doctoral thesis, or an adaptation therefrom. It should be judged mainly, therefore, with respect to its contributions to knowledge. Unquestionably, Doctor Klein's volume meets the test. A vast amount of new material is provided, together with fresh points of view and suggestions for other investigations.

The Mesta was the organization which for nearly six centuries, 1273 to 1836, managed the Castilian migratory sheep industry. Heretofore that corporation has been charged with responsibility for many of the economic ills from which Spain has suffered, such as deforestation, the decline of agriculture, and depopulation. Dr. Klein points out that previous writers have depended upon the phraseology of laws and the prejudiced discussions of the Mesta's opponents, while he has

made use of materials showing what the actual administration was. Once again it becomes clear—a lesson that all too few writers on Hispanic subjects have yet learned—that there is a wide gulf between Hispanic law and Hispanic practice. We learn that the Mesta was not as bad as it has been painted—though one inevitably concludes that it was as bad as it was able to be. Its era of greatness, however, covered only the reigns of the Catholic Kings and the Emperor Charles V.—less than a century. Before that period, and afterward, it was not in fact so powerful as has been asserted. Another interesting matter here set forth is the relation of the Mesta to the development of the Royal ideal of centralization and absolutism, as opposed to the many disintegrating forces of Spanish life. As a rule, king and Mesta went hand in hand, until Charles III. reversed the usual procedure of Spanish autocrats by inflicting a death-blow on the, by that time, utterly discredited Mesta.

The principal contribution of this volume is in its revelation of previously unused materials. The author has citations to a wide variety of sources, but has depended primarily on the archive of the Mesta, "untouched by historians, for some two hundred years", until he himself consulted it in Madrid. This consists of about six thousand items, "several hundred of which are stout folio volumes". The documents cover the years 1371 to 1836, but are especially numerous for the sixteenth century, which is the period most adequately treated by Dr. Klein. This archive, together with several other items in the author's bibliography, should prove to be a veritable treasure-house for the study of Spanish agrarian history.

In handling materials, and in matters of form and style, this volume is like others of its class. It is arranged in five successive chronologies: organization of the Mesta; the story of its most notable judicial officer, the *alcalde entregador*; local taxation; royal taxation; and pasturage. As a result, much is half-told when first encountered, and there are frequent repetitions. The same faults of construction appear in the organization of chapters as in the book as a whole. There is something in the unconscious hit of one of the reviewer's pupils who described this volume as "an exhausting treatise".

Some criticism may be made on other accounts. Titles of books in Spanish are entered in haphazard fashion, with no discoverable rule for the use of capitals or lower case. Scores of accents are lacking, and some at least (*e.g.*, pp. 303, 310, 420) are improperly present. For example, on page 81, of eight proper names entitled to an accent three are accented and five are not. Yet two of the former ("López" and "Fernández") are used elsewhere without accent (*e.g.*, pp. 213, 215, 264), and at least one of the latter ("Gomez") occasionally is (*e.g.*, pp. 89, 114) or is not (*e.g.*, pp. 200, 215) accented. Several misspellings (pp. 19, 55, 132, 155, 180, 226) and typographical errors (pp. 35, 78, 108, 189, 279, 293, 413) were not caught in proof-reading.

Most of the above-mentioned defects are nothing more than the inseparable accompaniment of a detailed piece of research. Presumably, they will keep this book from being read by the general public or indeed by any who are not fairly well grounded in Spanish history. For the investigator in kindred fields, however, and for the lecturer in Spanish history, Dr. Klein's volume is invaluable.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN.

Ceylon and the Portuguese, 1505-1658. By P. E. PIERIS, Litt.D., assisted by R. B. NAISH, B.A. (Tallipalai: American Ceylon Mission Press. 1920. Pp. x, 290, vii. Rs. 3.50.)

THIS work retells in more popular form the story already given to the public in the author's learned volumes on Ceylon, that public having been primarily the Ceylonese. It was a laudable thought to present the original material in a shape more intelligible to the English reader, omitting the minuteness of detail which would not interest the general public. The present volume, then, contains the gist of the earlier larger one, and it may be said at once that it is a very readable and reliable account of the activities of the Portuguese for the century and a half during which they were in Ceylon. It is preceded by a short sketch of the history of that fair but unfortunate isle from the time when Rama invaded it, as related in the Iliad of India, to that of the embassy to Rome, the repression of heresy by royal decree in the third century (the Buddhists of history are not so tolerant as those of fiction), and the invasions from the continent, as late as the twelfth century (they had begun a thousand years before).

Vasco da Gama sailed in a vessel of 120 tons to exploit India in 1498 and seven years later the first "Viceroy of India" set out from the Tagus and with incredible speed got possession of Singhalese trade and of the country as well, through the simple expedient of sending de Sousa ashore to tell the king that the Portuguese had come to protect them from their enemies and would like to be well paid for it. The king of Ceylon was grateful and promised the strangers the equivalent of seventy thousand kilos of cinnamon a year on condition that they should guard his coasts from all external enemies. Although the Hindus have fables touching on the eager desire of carnivora to persuade herbivora to be protected by friendly claw and fang, the Singhalese welcomed their guardian guests and even permitted them to erect a stone monument to commemorate the occasion, which still mendaciously states that the Portuguese arrived in 1501 (instead of Nov., 1505). However, busied with other matters, the invaders for some time left the Singhalese to themselves, and when they returned they found the island practically under Moorish influence. The inhabitants, roused by these new protectors, attacked the Portuguese, who promptly drove off the rabble and "erected a small fort". Negotiations were

resumed; to the cinnamon, the king added an annual allowance of rubies and elephants for defending his coasts. The rest was not easy but inevitable. The Portuguese became unpopular (propagation of their religion helped at first to make them so), were attacked, used firearms effectively, got the upper hand, and "friendly relations were reestablished". By taking sides in native quarrels, the Portuguese became holders of the balance of power between native rivals, and Francis Xavier arrived in 1542 to complete their influence. Whole villages were baptized daily and, as converts were made exempt from tribute, the true faith waxed mightily. No scruple of honor interfered with the breaking of promises made to native authorities; avarice and lust turned Portuguese gentlemen into procurers and callous spectators of suffering. So the sad story goes on, till at last the Hollanders ousted the Portuguese in 1658.

Customs and usages are picturesquely if adventitiously described in this admirable little history and many facts not generally known are noted: for example, that though the Buddhists ignore caste, only the highest-caste men could become priests, and that serpents and cattle are divided into castes. The "caste of a cobra" exceeds even Brahmanical ideas.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

La Réforme en Italie. Par E. RODOCANACHI. Deuxième Partie.
(Paris: Picard. 1921. 10 fr.)

IN Count Rodocanachi's second volume, one looks naturally to see how he has fulfilled the promise of the first (which was "to set forth the various reasons which brought about the disappearance of Protestantism in Italy"), and how, having steered away from a biographical method, he is going to avoid the geographical in a country where the movement can hardly be made to seem homogeneous. He is still avoiding familiar phrases which indicate a confessional bent, for he has not called this second part the "Counter-Reform", though that would be the obvious title, treating as it does the condemnation at the Council of Trent of the doctrine of justification by faith, and the repression of the revolt in the Church based on that doctrine, together with the actuation of a programme of reform in discipline, which, according to the preface of the author in the first part, accomplished the real purpose of the reformers in Italy. Unluckily the author has not distinguished between what may be called the indigenous reform, which was indeed rather on discipline than on dogmas, and the influence of the Lutheran and Calvinistic movements, which, especially in the north, gave the reform in Italy a different character, one more particularly doctrinal; and the first part, devoted to the doctrinal reform, seems to give the lie to the thesis laid down in the preface.

In this second part, the attempt is made to follow a strictly chrono-

logical order, and to set forth, under the reigns of the appropriate popes, the promised causes of the disappearance of Protestantism in Italy. It is then upon the Council of Trent, the Jesuits, the Inquisition, and the Index, the constructive and the destructive agencies of the Counter-Reform, that we shall expect attention to be directed. And on all these subjects, the welcome résumé of the most recent works would be beyond criticism were not the chronological method either abandoned as soon as adopted, or else maintained with confusing results.

There is no attempt to relate the history of the Reform to the political currents of the time, nor to give coherence to the confusion of details. One regrets that the book could not have been in the form of a dictionary, something which would have made available the immense amount of material actually embodied in it. There is but one attempt at generalization in this second part, the reflective pages 316-320 on the "*déclin du mouvement protestant*".

Only the Reformation in Venice and that in Piedmont, the two parts of Italy which held out against Spain and the pope (except when politics were too strong for them), have been treated more at length, and outside of the chronological frame. Here the Reformation had a very different character. "*Il y a une grande analogie entre l'attitude du gouvernement vénitien et celle du gouvernement sarde [sic].*" And in fact Jalla, the historian of the Waldensians, pointed out that in Piedmont the inquisitors must be assisted by a lay judge—who was not until 1580 replaced by a representative of the bishop. And even after the French occupation in 1536, although the theory was more rigorous towards the Protestants, the practice was indulgent until the accession of Henry II. It is well known that at Venice was maintained the institution of the *Tre Savi dell' Eresia* (p. 503), three laymen appointed by the state to be present at all heresy trials.

The pages on the Jesuits and the Index are, with the account of the history and machinery of the Holy Office, a compendium of much value on themes which Protestants slur or fail to treat with equanimity. The author has used not merely Tacchi-Venturi and Buschbell, the latest historians of the subjects, but the Vatican archives. His narrative is quite impartial, indeed colorless. Nowhere is he betrayed into any show of feeling, except when, speaking of the persecution of the Waldensians in the kingdom of Naples, he reminds us, by way of extenuation of an extermination unexampled elsewhere in Italy, that the carnage took place "*en un pays soumis à la domination espagnole et qu'on opérait ainsi dans le royaume de Philippe II.*" (p. 255).

Any history of the Reform must fall into two divisions, the Protestant and the Catholic Reform, and any history of the Catholic Reform must distinguish between the middle men and women like Contarini and Pole and Giulia Gonzaga and Vittoria Colonna, and the uncompromising

advocates of repression like Carafa (Paul IV.), Ghisleri (Pius V.), and Della Casa, authors of the Inquisition and the Index. The former, and not the latter, were those who steadied the Church of Rome and met the criticisms on discipline, if not on dogma, at the Council of Trent, ably assisted by the exponents of Christian piety as it had been known in an age long past. Theatines, Barnabites, Capucins, Jesuits. Protestant historians of the Reform have emphasized the agents of repression (in which they have included the Jesuits) and Catholic historians the moderate men and the Council of Trent, which crowned the work of these, however short it came of the ideas of Contarini and of Morone himself, leading figure there. Rodocanachi does not even let the word "Catholic Reform", or "Counter-Reform", pass his lips (or pen), though evidently, thinking of the Reform which was based on the controversy over Justification (so far as it was based on dogma at all), he has the conception of a Counter-Reform, of the Council of Trent as crowning the work of Contarini rather than of St. Francis. As his first part began with the reform in the spirit of Luther, so his second part with the response by Leo X. and his first successors, thus succeeding Philippon as the first part succeeded McCrie. The coherence that would have been given the first part by showing the relation of the reform programme in Italy to Valdes, who is acknowledged to be the one whose thought was of greatest influence, is aimed at in the second part by the chronological method already referred to. The success is as little in the one case as in the other.

Some typographical errors must be due to the calligraphy of the author: thus "Gamfi" for Garufi (p. 173, n. 1); "Gugliolono Grattaroli" for Guglielmo Grataroli (p. 514); "Nous" for Nores (p. 123, n. 1). The bibliography at the end of the volume attests a wide acquaintance with the printed literature of the subject—there is no reference to archive material; and that acquaintance appears almost exhaustive when it is seen that a host of monographs and articles cited in the text are not listed in the bibliography.

F. C. CHURCH.

The History of English Parliamentary Privilege. By CARL WITKE, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of American History in the Ohio State University. [Ohio State University Studies, Contributions in History and Political Science, no. 6.] (Columbus: the University. 1921. Pp. 212.)

PARLIAMENTARY privilege bulks large in the history of the English Parliament, and at times it plays a leading rôle on the wider stage of English constitutional history. All historians of the constitution have something to say of the various privileges that have been exercised by the houses of Parliament, and the authors of treatises on parliamentary practice and procedure describe them in some detail. Little attention

has been paid, however, to the legal conceptions underlying the claims of privilege. To explain these conceptions, to interpret basic principles, is the aim of the author of the present monograph, and it should be said at once that he has done a scholarly and valuable piece of work. His interest in the subject was aroused by the brief discussion of parliamentary privilege in Professor McIlwain's *The High Court of Parliament and its Supremacy*, and his study was begun in Professor McIlwain's seminar in the history of English legal institutions at Harvard.

Professor Wittke dissents strongly from the view expressed by Professor Josef Redlich in his *Procedure of the House of Commons* that the judicial claims of the Commons in modern times were in the nature of a cloak for their political ambitions. For the origin of parliamentary privilege we must go back, he thinks, to the time when there were several separate bodies of law in England, the *lex forestae* and the *lex mercatoria*, for example, each declared and enforced by its own appropriate courts. One of these "laws" was that which Coke called *lex et consuetudo parliamenti*, the law peculiar to the highest court in the realm, the High Court of Parliament, supposed to be known only to parliament men and to be declared by them exclusively. It was from this *lex parliamenti* that each house of Parliament claimed to derive its privileges. For centuries the conception prevailed that this law was distinct from, and superior to, the law of the land, and that what either house of Parliament did under it could not be questioned by any inferior court.

This doctrine has at times served the cause of popular freedom, but it was easily invoked to justify extensions of parliamentary privilege that were as serious a menace to individual liberty as was the doctrine of a *lex prerogativa* above the common law. The privilege of freedom from arrest and molestation was no doubt essential to the authority and dignity of the House of Commons, but the extension of the privilege to members' servants and estates became a source of grave injustice. It is difficult to regard as anything other than a public nuisance a privilege by virtue of which persons found trespassing on the lands of members of Parliament were punished by the House of Commons for breach of privilege and removed from the jurisdiction of the common-law courts. In days when kings were despotic and judges servile it may have been necessary in the interest of constitutional liberty for the House to determine cases of disputed elections, but this privilege wears a different aspect when it comes to be exercised by the party in control of the House for partizan purposes.

Professor Wittke's main theme is the relation of parliamentary privilege to the law of the land, and the most original and valuable chapters in his monograph are those that deal with the conflict between *lex parliamenti* and *lex terrae*. His analysis of cases involving privilege, extending from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century, re-

veals the persistence, almost to our own time, of the idea of a separate law of Parliament, superior to the law of the land. The newer view of *lex parliamenti*, which regards it as a part of *lex terrae* and brings questions of parliamentary privilege within the jurisdiction of the common-law courts, was expressed by Chief Justice Holt in *Regina v. Paty* more than two hundred years ago, but it had to wait for its triumph till the great case of *Stockdale v. Hansard*. Even as late as the Bradlaugh incident, forty years ago, echoes of the old doctrine were heard in the course of debates in the House of Commons. As Professor Pollard has observed, parliamentary privilege was the last of the medieval liberties to be reduced by the common law.

In the organization of his material the author has been guided by his controlling interest. This is as it should be, but cases of parliamentary privilege which illustrate the conflict between the law of Parliament and the law of the land also exemplify the development of specific privileges. It would therefore have been desirable had the author, in the chapter in which he deals with the privileges of Parliament in general, referred more frequently to cases which he discusses in later chapters. There are a few errors of fact in the monograph, but they do not seriously impair its value as a contribution to English legal and constitutional history.

R. L. SCHUYLER.

Commons Debates for 1629, critically edited, and an Introduction dealing with Parliamentary Sources for the Early Stuarts. Edited by WALLACE NOTESTEIN, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Minnesota,¹ and FRANCES HELEN RELF, Ph.D., Professor of History in Lake Erie College. [Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in the Social Sciences, no. 10.] (Minneapolis: the University. 1921. Pp. lxxvii, 304. \$4.00.)

THIS is a most welcome piece of pioneer work, a first step, it is to be hoped, in hastening the preparation of a new Parliamentary History, the need for which the editors not only reiterate but convincingly demonstrate. There exist masses of unprinted material absolutely essential for a true understanding of the course of events. The seemingly official character of the *Parliamentary History* and the *Journals* has in the past misled the unwary, like a certain European official who, because he wore a uniform, succeeded in pressing an occasional counterfeit coin in change upon unsuspecting travellers. For the short but momentous session of 1629 Professors Notestein and Relf "have tried to collect in one place all the yet unprinted materials" bearing on the proceedings of the House of Commons.

In an introduction of some fifty ample pages they have told us

¹ Now of Cornell University.

much about the sources for 1629, including the *Journals*, which they have not undertaken to reprint. By studying the manuscripts preserved in the library of the House of Commons they have shown that there are two sources for the printed version—the "Book of Notes" or jottings made during the actual session, written in a hurried, scrawling hand, with many abbreviations, omissions, subsequent alterations, and corrections, and the "Clerk's Book", *i.e.*, "the finished perfected record". For many sessions, certainly for 1629, the latter or authorized version has either been lost or was never completed, so that what we now have in print was to some extent derived from rough notes no more reliable than other records, such as those from the practised hand of Sir Edward Nicholas.

The first supplement to the *Journals* and the *Parliamentary History* which the editors have provided is a recension of the *True Relation*. Although this account has been reprinted many times since its original publication in 1641, the present aim has been to furnish a standard text, made up from the printed versions, which vary more or less from one another, and from manuscript accounts, forty-eight of which have been located. Moreover, they have sought to determine how the *Relation* was composed and why the variations occur. Contrary to the view of John Bruce that all are derived from a common original and that diversities are due to ignorance or carelessness of copyists, they contend, with effective evidence, that what we now have are a number of distinct compilations, made at different times by different hands from contemporary news-letters and separates. These latter were sometimes carefully prepared accounts by speakers themselves who, like our modern legislators, had more than one motive for getting into print; but more often, like the matter for the news-letters, they were obtained by the stationers in devious and indirect ways. With such materials to work upon, even the reconstruction of the *True Relation* which the present editors have presented is bound to be somewhat conjectural, but it is far more coherent and reliable than any previous edition, and variant readings have been provided in foot-notes. Obviously we have got a long way from good old D'Ewes who, as a recent writer has pointed out, did not hesitate to make sense where that was lacking or to frame fragmentary notes into a readable narrative.

Further to aid the student of the period the editors have printed the diaries of Sir Edward Nicholas and Sir Richard Grosvenor. The latter they properly regard as the more valuable contribution since it has never been used by any writer in print, while Gardiner employed the former to much advantage in his valuable chapter on the Parliament of 1629. Some letters of Nethersole, and an account of the dramatic sitting of March 2, complete the volume. Professors Notestein and Relf have done a vast amount of intelligent research, the difficulties of which will be especially appreciated by those who have struggled

with the crabbed handwriting of the period, and the further contributions which they promise will be awaited with much interest. There is little to criticize adversely. It might have been well to point out that debates ceased to be reported in the *Journals* after 1629, and to indicate more clearly that Nethersole's letters were addressed to Elizabeth, sister of Charles I., though, since the work will be used chiefly by specialists, these are omissions of minor importance.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

Histoire de Belgique. Par H. PIRENNE, Professeur à l'Université de Gand. Tome V. *La Fin du Régime Espagnol, le Régime Autrichien, la Révolution Brabançonne et la Révolution Liégeoise.* (Brussels: Henri Lamertin. 1921. Pp. xiii, 584.)

SOMEWHAT over twenty years ago appeared a book which, in the judgment of a contemporary reviewer, Paul Fredericq, longtime friend and colleague of the author, opened a new era in Belgian historiography—the first volume of the work which has now reached its fifth, a work which when completed will not only be universally accepted as the standard history of its nation, but will be reckoned among the most substantial and enduring products of historical scholarship in its generation. Brilliant perhaps it is not, though not wanting in graphic touches; not "thrilling" or "gripping", after the manner of the "best sellers" in universal history; but solid and scientific; severely exact, and impregably fortified by documents; direct, lucid, sincere; disdaining tricks of rhetoric, and carrying conviction by the weight of its learning and the soundness of its judgment; a veritable monument of erudition; the ripe fruit of a lifetime of study.

Before Pirenne, the history of Belgium had been treated in a rather desultory and fragmentary manner. It is Pirenne's peculiar merit to have divined in that history a unifying principle and to have demonstrated its continuity. If he may be said to have propounded a thesis it is this, that, however recent may be the attainment of independent statehood, there has existed among the people of the *Pays-Bas*, certainly from Burgundian times if not longer, a consciousness of solidarity which in its essence is nothing less than the sentiment of nationalism. Dormant it might seem to be at times, and at times was; but only dormant, as a Philip and a Joseph discovered, to their discomfiture. Denied and repressed it might be, by Spaniard, Austrian, Frenchman, and Dutchman, in turn; yet it was not extinguished, nor could it be. It persisted and revived; and showed itself never more heroic than when threatened. "Nous nous sommes surtout sentis frères aux époques de crise, aux moments où le salut dépendait de l'effort et du sacrifice librement consentis", says the historian (p. xii), and history affirms the judgment. Let the latest oppressor bear witness, he who contemptuously declared that there was "no Belgian nation, only a

political abstraction lacking the foundations of national unity", only "a diplomatic makeshift, vain and mischievous". "Ce que la recherche patiente avait découvert dans le passé, le présent en démontrait la justesse", retorts the historian (p. xi). Let the German refute the assertion.

But the vehemence of the reviewer comports ill with the self-restraint of the author. For the author has written, as he resolved to write, "*sine ira et studio*, sans colère et sans prévention", free "de toute passion qui ne fût pas celle de la vérité" (pp. vii-viii). Not even deportation and imprisonment (for both Pirenne and Fredericq were deported for their resistance to the transformation of the University of Ghent into a Flemish university); not even the death of a gallant son on the field of honor, could swerve him from his lofty purpose. In all his pages there is not a word of reviling, not even a trace of bitterness. Throughout, the same "placidité souveraine" that Fredericq noted in another work, produced under happier auspices; throughout, an imperturbable judicial calm—a more crushing rebuke to the oppressor than the most virulent polemic. One scarcely knows which the more to admire, the poise of the scholar, or the magnanimity of the man.

Perhaps the finest portions of the volume are the broad survey of social and intellectual conditions, the portrait of Charles of Lorraine, the characterization of Joseph II., and the chapters on the Brabant Revolution. Far from heroic were the years between the Peace of Westphalia and the outbreak of the revolution. This might be said of the most of Europe during that century and a half. But for Belgium in particular they were years of political inaction, intellectual torpor, and cultural stagnation. One looks in vain for great names and great achievements in art or science or letters—nothing original, nothing vital. Belgium seemed to be untouched by the currents of thought moving in Germany and France and England. The passing of the Spaniard and the coming of the Austrian made no change. "Au lieu d'une infante ou d'un infant une archiduchesse résida au palais de Bruxelles. A une cour espagnole succéda une cour allemande, et ce fut tout" (p. 169). Even economic life lacked the oldtime vigor, until, about the middle of the eighteenth century, it received a fresh impetus from the ministers of Maria Theresa. The last years of the "sweet and ancient rule of the House of Austria" were years of general prosperity and contentment, placid, monotonous, dull. Then came Joseph the Enlightened, and an awakening sudden and rude. To the rule of indulgence succeeded the rule of efficiency. Innovations and reforms followed thick and fast, until an outraged people was goaded to revolt. It was the most paradoxical of revolutions—a rising against reform, a "conflict between an enlightened sovereign and a backward people faithful to an archaic constitution" (pp. 418-419). Even a

representative system coming from a Joseph II. was rejected as an instrument of despotism and a violation of the ancient liberties! The annulment of the Joyeuse Entrée was the stroke that severed the bond between Belgium and the House of Austria.

The rest is too well known to require repeating—the death of Joseph, defeated and chagrined; the conciliatory concessions of Leopold; Valmy and Jemappes; the approach of Dumouriez; and the swallowing up of Belgium by the revolutionary flood that swept over the frontiers from France. It is a vivid picture, drawn by a sure and masterly hand. Space does not permit of extended or minute criticism. But one detail in particular is certain to arrest the attention of the American—the formation of the United States of Belgium (January 11, 1790), a federative state, in which each province retained its sovereignty, but delegated the exercise of it, in matters touching the common interest, to a sovereign congress, composed of the same persons as the Estates-General, and renewable every three years.

Nul doute que l'on ait pris pour modèle en ceci les États-Unis d'Amérique. . . . Mais on ne s'inspire de leur exemple que dans la lettre et non dans l'esprit. La constitution américaine, dominée par la déclaration des droits, a fondé la première démocratie moderne. Celle des États-Belgiques, au contraire, orientée vers la passé, n'accorde de droits qu'aux ordres privilégiés. . . . Entre elle et la constitution américaine rien n'est commun que les apparences (p. 479).

THEODORE COLLIER.

The English Factories in India, 1655-1660. By WILLIAM FOSTER, C.I.E. [Published under the patronage of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India.] (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1921. Pp. 7, 440. 16s.)

Early Travels in India, 1583-1619. Edited by WILLIAM FOSTER, C.I.E. (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1921. Pp. xiv, 351. 12s. 6d.)

WHEN, some fifteen years ago, Mr. William Foster published the first volume of the calendar of documents in the India Office under the title of *The English Factories in India*, continuing the work begun in the publication of *Letters to the East India Company from its Servants in the East*, a new era opened in the historiography of British expansion in India. Thanks to these two series it became possible to discover and to narrate the facts of that extraordinary movement, as it had not been before. For while it is true that the labors of Bruce and his successors had done much to illumine the darkness of Indian history, it was not until the documents in the case were available that it was possible for scholars to unravel the tangled threads of the Company's history in the first years of the seventeenth century.

The *Letters* covered the period from 1602 to 1617, the first nine

volumes of the *Calendars* the period from 1616 to 1655. The present volume of calendars includes the years from 1655 to 1660. But with it the plan somewhat changes; for this tenth volume is not, like its predecessors, a calendar. It approaches more nearly to a history, for it "extracts merely those passages which seemed to merit preservation, and to connect them by a narrative which would at the same time embody the information obtained from other documents which it was not thought necessary to quote in full".

Such a change in plan, forced upon Mr. Foster by the increasing number of documents, has, it is evident, certain advantages combined with certain drawbacks. To the reader it is obviously clearer and more interesting than any collection of documents could ever be—if, indeed, readers ever read collections of documents. To the investigator it is unquestionably a defect, for it may well happen that the precise piece of minute information which he seeks was not considered of sufficient importance or pertinence to include in this narrative. Moreover, the references are relegated to pages at the end of the volume; and it is, perhaps, not out of place to suggest that a simple list of the papers here used—though there are eleven hundred of them—would not have been amiss.

None the less it is an ungrateful task to find fault with a work which adds so much to our knowledge of a period known hitherto, if at all, chiefly through the travels of Bernier and Tavernier; and it is to be hoped that the Secretary of State for India and the Council may be able to continue this great work, which contributes so much to a field of historical research growing in interest and importance year by year.

How great that increase of interest seems to be is indicated by this second volume edited by Mr. Foster. To all students of Indian history the narratives of Fitch and Mildenhall and their successors are known through the work of Hakluyt and Purchas. But to many who are familiar neither with those publications, nor with the lucubrations of the author of the *Crudities*, that strange, far-wandering egotist Coryat, the reprinting of these narratives of English travellers in India between 1583 and 1619 will be an interesting and informing volume. Not the least interesting, and undoubtedly the most valuable, feature of the book is the collection of introductions and notes which witness the learning and the industry of the editor, and give the collection unusual and permanent value to the student as well as to the general reader, for whom it is apparently intended. And it is of more than ordinary interest to see this development in the study of British beginnings in India at the moment when such changes seem to impend in the empire, even in the unchanging East.

W. C. ABBOTT.

The Wars of Marlborough, 1702-1709. In two volumes. By FRANK TAYLOR, sometime Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford. Edited by G. WINIFRED TAYLOR, M.A.Oxon., with an Introduction by the Hon. J. W. FORTESCUE, C.V.O. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1921. Pp. xvi, 466; vii, 555. 50s.)

As its title indicates, this extensive work is a military history rather than a complete life of Marlborough, although, as the author states in his preface, he had planned to combine the researches of Archdeacon Coxe and Lord Wolseley in a single volume. So far from accomplishing this task, seven-eighths of these two large volumes are devoted to the events, mainly military, of somewhat less than eight years, for the chapter on the siege of Tournai is unfinished. A sketch of the first fifty-two years of Marlborough's life, in seven short chapters, is relegated to the end of the second volume.

In fact the entire work is a fragment, to which Mr. Taylor, who died in 1913, at the age of forty, gave the greater part of the last eight years of his life, reading, writing, and visiting the scenes of the principal operations in the best of all possible ways, on foot. Had he lived to complete it, no doubt he would have considerably revised and probably compressed his manuscript before publication. The chapters already apparently completed, and the drafts of others, have been pieced together and prepared for the printer in a very competent manner by his sister, who has documented them, as far as possible, by the citation of authorities, and supplied a charming memoir and an adequate bibliography.

Macaulay has, with characteristic dogmatism, described Marlborough as "a prodigy of turpitude", and asserted that "there was no guilt and no disgrace that he was not willing to incur". Thackeray's vivid but malicious portrait in *Esmond* is widely known.

As Mr. Taylor himself admits, his tone is polemical and he frankly writes as an ardent partizan; he constantly extols Marlborough's transcendent merits as a general and a diplomatist, and blinks or extenuates his faults and moral defects. He is scarcely less restrained as an eulogist than Coxe or Lediard. His main objects in writing, as he candidly explains, were to remind his countrymen, in the first place, "of England's place in Europe", and, secondly, of "the real nature and true significance of war", and in this connection he says, "I hold with Dalrymple that 'to write history, without drawing moral or political rules of conduct from it, is little better than writing a romance'" (I, xiii).

Accordingly he starts off with a short chapter on war, which is followed by a second, significantly entitled the Exorbitant Power of France in 1702, this expression being borrowed from the last speech to the British Parliament by King William III., in which he declared that such "exorbitant power" threatened "the rest of Christendom with

a general calamity". The acts of the ministry of Godolphin and his relations with Marlborough are then briefly described.

Judged by Marlborough's own high standard, Mr. Taylor confesses that the results of his campaign of 1702 fell much short of his aims, although judged by the standard of most of his contemporaries it seemed brilliant indeed.

In the third campaign, the long and trying march of the British troops from the Meuse to the Danube is admirably described and special stress is laid on the careful efforts of their chief to keep them in good fighting trim. The author's very clear accounts of the battles of the Schellenberg and Blenheim have been carefully verified by an examination of the ground which it appears has not greatly changed. Of the campaign of 1707, Mr. Taylor finely says:

The Grand Alliance, cowering in the shadow of the northern peril, riven by internal dissensions, and stricken by three successive defeats, seemed visibly to collapse. But always in the background, and oftentimes unseen of the eyes of the multitude, stood the Captain-General of England, exhorting one, counselling another, inspiring all, encouraging here, reprimanding there, supervising everywhere, contriving, uniting, foreseeing, organizing, reorganizing—a giant figure, supporting, with labours that transcended the credible, the tottering fabric of the coalition (II, 52-53).

The narrative practically terminates with the battle of Malplaquet, which Mr. Taylor terms justly enough, "a great battle and a great victory", although he qualifies this statement by the admission that "the victors were too weakened by their losses and too exhausted by their efforts to pursue an enemy whose demeanour to the last was wonderfully firm" (II, 378).

Next to Marlborough and Eugene, he bestows unstinted praise upon their able adversaries, Boufflers and Villars.

For his materials he rarely seems to have gone beyond printed sources, but among these he has read widely, consulting not only most of the English but many French and German authorities. References are, however, occasionally made to the Coxe, Hare, Stepney, and Stowe collections of manuscripts in the British Museum. Among printed documents cited, his principal quarries are the letters and despatches printed by Coxe, Lediard, and Sir George Murray.

As a whole the book is effectively written and must take a high place in the literature of the subject as a most readable and entertaining, if not an altogether reliable history.

The map of the Western Sphere of Operations (scale 1:1,000,000), besides roughly showing certain important natural features of the country, such as heaths, moors, and swamps, many of which have long since disappeared, gives an outline of the famous French lines in Brabant; and that of the Eastern Sphere, on the same scale, indicates the different stages of the march to the Danube, with the date of each.

Excellent plans are provided of the battles of Schellenberg, Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde, 1 to 6 p.m., and also at 7 p.m., and Malplaquet, on a scale of 1:40,000, with contours at intervals of five metres. The general index and a special index of place-names are satisfactory and the make-up of the book is praiseworthy.

E. A. CRUIKSHANK.

Zur Preussischen und Deutschen Geschichte. Aufsätze und Vorträge von REINHOLD KOSER. (Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger. 1921. Pp. iii, 432. M. 25; bound, M. 36.)

REINHOLD KOSER, the author of this volume of essays, died in August, 1914. He will be remembered for three things. He was head of the Prussian archives, where his wise and liberal administration was a real service to scholarship. He was for some years the choice of the academies of Berlin, Munich, and Vienna to direct work on the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. But he will be longest remembered as the author of the standard life of Frederick the Great, and of a political history of Prussia which, by reason of his death, was carried only through the first volume to 1648.

Koser belonged to the Ranke-Sybel school of political historians and represented its best traditions. His work is always substantial and, as might be expected, is usually based on wide study of archival material. He was at his best when he had the elbow-room of solid volumes in which to present his results. His mind and his style do not show at their best in essays. He was not a brilliant generalizer, lacked dialectic skill, and could not point his thoughts with a telling phrase. When he wrote an essay or delivered an address, it was of a kind that you might expect to find cited in Dahlmann-Waitz.

Of the thirteen essays, the first nine are arranged chronologically according to the period or persons treated. They range from a general survey of the Great Elector, the least valuable in the volume, to a study of Frederick William IV, on the eve of the March revolution of 1848. Like Mr. Dick in *David Copperfield*, who could not keep King Charles's head out of his memoir, Koser returns again and again to the subject of his life-work, Frederick the Great. What preceding ages or rulers contributed to him or his work, or later ones derived from it by imitation or contrast, is called constantly to the reader's attention. The second essay compares the naval and maritime policies of the Great Elector and of Frederick, the third treats the first queen, Sophie Charlotte, and although her vendetta against Danckelmann, the all-powerful minister, is the chief theme, her relations to Frederick William, the father of Frederick, are not forgotten. The founding of the foreign office in 1728 with the excellent summary of Ilgen's memoir helps to explain the situation perpetuated under Frederick and his suc-

cessors to 1806. The general survey of Frederick's reign lacks those high lights that Delbrück or Meinecke or Marcks throw on any period that they know as well as Koser knew the age of Frederick. The essay on Frederick and the Prussian universities admits, of course, that Frederick was more interested in the Berlin Academy than in higher education. Koser has, nevertheless, made his treatment a history of the Prussian universities in the eighteenth century. How familiar it all sounds! The student body lacks interest in scholarship and needs discipline. The professors are dry and pedantic. Salaries and recruiting from neighboring universities at higher than the regular stipend are burning questions. Professors called from Göttingen to Halle use the negotiations to get an increased salary at Göttingen. And the study of Greek is declining! The longest essay is a survey, based on published material, of Prussian policy from 1786 to 1806. This is a very useful synthesis for those who do not command the mass of special studies on this period. The review of Cavaignac under the title of Prussian Reform Legislation in relation to the French Revolution is a just critique of that author, but in suggesting the continuity of the Prussian reform era with the past, it misses the finer things in the spirit of the two ages. The excellent essay on Frederick William in 1848 is still valuable because of its use of archival material, but is weak as a character-study. The essay on the epochs in the development of the absolute monarchy is a fine example of what history can contribute to political theory and demolishes Roscher's oft-repeated formula. The essay on the beginning of political parties in Prussia before 1849 seems sketchy when compared with the solid work done in this field. The concluding essays on the Rhine provinces and Prussia, and on Louis XIV. (a review of Lavissee), keep to their theme with but little of that nationalism evident in other Prussian historians who have dealt with similar topics. But that little, with its possible bearing on present-day problems, may explain their position at the close of the volume.

The volume fortifies rather than makes a reputation. It is a convenience to have scattered essays brought into easily available form and on paper that is up to pre-war quality.

G. S. FORD.

Histoire de France Contemporaine depuis la Révolution jusqu'à la Paix de 1919. Publiée sous la direction de ERNEST LAVISSEE. Tome I., *La Révolution, 1789-1792.* Par P. SAGNAC. Tome II., *La Révolution, 1792-1799.* Par G. PARISSET. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1920. Pp. 440; 439.)

THE decision of M. Lavissee to add to his monumental *Histoire de France* this *Histoire de la France Contemporaine* has brought satisfaction to all lovers of French history. The studies of the last half cen-

tury upon the historical development of modern France have nowhere else been embodied in a view sufficiently comprehensive. The first two volumes certainly offer the best balanced treatment of the French Revolution in existence. The only work comparable is the *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française* of Professor Aulard, and this is restricted in scope, as its title suggests.

Both Professor Sagnac and Professor Pariset have long been known for their work on the Revolutionary period. Readers of the *Cambridge Modern History* will recall Professor Pariset's chapters on the Consulate and the Empire. Among Professor Sagnac's works the most notable are his *Législation Civile de la Révolution*, his *Chûte de la Royauté*, and his *Rhin Français*. He is also one of the chief collaborators in the publication of documents and studies on the economic history of the Revolution which is renewing the view of the whole subject.

In method both volumes are characterized by the surprising amount of detailed information which the authors give without interrupting the flow of exposition or narrative. There is nothing of the digest, no feeling of pages encumbered with learned minutiae. The opinions of the authors are not obtruded. The facts tell the story, with only enough of interpretation to stimulate the reader's thought. This is perhaps truer of Professor Sagnac's than of Professor Pariset's volume. The most typical case is the former's second book, which has as its theme "L'Oeuvre de l'Assemblée Constituante". Here are skilfully combined reviews of the discussions which resulted in legislation, significant features of the laws themselves, and the experience of different parts of the country with their application. A single sentence here and there gives us a hint of the author's opinion. For example, it is only at the end of the discussion of the early issues of the assignats that Professor Sagnac expresses the view that borrowing "à jet continu au moyen de la planche aux assignats" had "une répercussion funeste sur toute l'économie nationale". The only controversial remark is that the alternative was "la banqueroute générale".

The more difficult problem of organization fell to the lot of Professor Sagnac. Professor Pariset's volume, covering a longer period of time, from September 21, 1792, to December 25, 1799, where the principal theme appears to be political turmoil and foreign war, may more readily follow the chronological order. It is difficult, if not impossible, to treat the great reconstructive work of the Constituent Assembly in this way. Fundamental reforms emerged from committee rooms and were enacted into law often with little reference to the external history of the Revolution. The application of these laws is again something that does not fit readily into a chronological setting. The solution is a topical exposition. Consequently Professor Sagnac's narrative, which concludes in the first book with the events of October

5 and 6, is interrupted by the second book on the Work of the Assembly, and resumed in book III. The fourth book deals with the decline and fall of the monarchy, and the fifth with the first weeks of the Republic and the campaign of Valmy.

The most interesting literary feature of Professor Sagnac's work is his carefully finished portraits of the Revolutionary leaders, especially of Mirabeau, Danton, and Robespierre. Indeed, he has three portraits of Mirabeau, apropos of three distinct phases of his career in the Revolution. Each seems complete without the others, so that in the introductory sentences of the second and third there is a suggestion of repetition. In writing of Danton Professor Sagnac adds a note on the present controversy over the great tribune's alleged corrupt practices, expressing the opinion that as yet the charges are not proved. Although Professor Pariset gives no similar portraits, his conception of Danton is not so favorable, for in mentioning the fact that he had become very rich he adds the remark, "*On ne sait trop comment*". The attitude of the two authors towards Robespierre also differs slightly, but this may be in part the actual difference between the earlier and the later Robespierre. According to the first conception Robespierre the Constituent is hesitant, following rather than anticipating opinion; according to the second "*sa netteté, sa franchise coupante, sa résolution froide*" are the dominant characteristics.

Of the two writers Professor Pariset has, perhaps, had the better opportunity to present fresh interpretations of events and institutions, because investigation for the period of the Convention has not reached the stage of settled judgments to such a degree as for the period of the Constituent Assembly. His treatment of the Centrist party is distinctly new. He ascribes to it a positive policy of great influence, and never represents its members as an oscillating mass now drawn in one direction by Girondin eloquence, and now driven in another by Montagnard threats. Again, he denies that the country was actuated by fear in the summer of 1793. The people, he thinks, put a strong government in power in a mood of patriotic resolution, believing that the treason of Dumouriez and the Vendean insurrection imperilled the Revolution. Two policies were possible, that of Danton, and that of Robespierre—"Ou bien essayer de reconstituer l'unité patriote, ou bien continuer à gouverner avec le parti diminué". The policy of Robespierre was chosen, although that of Danton was in Professor Pariset's opinion more far-seeing, lofty, and humane. He adds, "*La politique de Robespierre a sauvé la France, mais elle a valu la Terreur avec un gouvernement*".

In one respect Professor Pariset's treatment is not so satisfying. He deals in the most summary way with the economic history of the period. The maximum legislation of the fall and winter of 1793 is barely touched. The collapse of paper money in 1796 also receives

slight comment. Another omission is the part in the fierce passions of the Terror taken by the emotions characteristic of a desperate war. This is surprising when we recall that the world has been passing through a similar experience.

Mention should be made of the illustrations, a feature which did not appear in the earlier volumes. They are selected from the incomparable collections of portraits, cartoons, and prints which exist in Paris. In the first volume, for example, are full-page illustrations of the supposed Houdon bust of Mirabeau and an anonymous portrait of Danton. The frontispiece of the second volume is an anonymous portrait of Robespierre.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Histoire de France Contemporaine (LAVISSE). Tome III., *Le Consulat et l'Empire*. Par G. PARiset. (Paris: Hachette. 1921. Pp. 444.)

M. PARiset is master of his subject, and in this volume, as in its predecessor, has made a distinct contribution to the historiography of the Napoleonic period. The hero-worship of earlier works, from Thiers's *Consulate and Empire* onward, no longer appears. Napoleon often dominates the stage, but many others hold it with him, and interest is focussed on the nation rather than on his fortunes. Neither is there the same respect for the populace of Paris that is so apparent in the work of Aulard and other later French historians. The emphasis is distinctly on the history of the French people as a whole. Further comparison with the work of Aulard brings out the fact that Pariset's treatment is fuller and richer. The former was avowedly concerned with the evolution of political life; the latter is more pragmatic, setting forth not only the political or constitutional changes but also the social organization, population, education, religion, industry, agriculture, and commerce. Foreign affairs could not, of course, be overlooked in the Napoleonic period but it is a far cry from this rather sketchy treatment of the subject to Sorel and others who make the history of France revolve about Napoleon. With Pariset, the imperialist designs of the conqueror receive scant attention. Frenchmen, he declares, did not understand them and became interested in them mainly through their disastrous consequences.

The author is at his best in tracing the development of political and social institutions. Not only is this done with great precision and detail, but for the most part with due regard to their revolutionary beginnings and the hard facts of contemporary life that lay behind them. Too little weight is perhaps given to the Concordat in the revival of Catholicism which the author dates from the 19 Fructidor. Industrial progress on the other hand, he treats too exclusively from the standpoint of Napoleon, forgetting the broad basis laid in the

earlier period, and the impetus then imparted by the manufacture of war materials.

Despite Napoleon's lack of knowledge of agriculture "qui était d'une ignorance qui dépasse les bornes", his interest in the important question of land tenure and inheritance deserves more attention. The laws of March and April, 1790, abolished primogeniture and established equal inheritance. "Partible succession" became the rule in France. The civil code confirmed this, and what is called "l'affranchissement de la terre" continued. By a law of 1806, however, entail was again permitted. This the author fails to mention, despite the fact that it provided a basis for a new landed aristocracy. Commerce is given rather exiguous treatment. Even in the last division of the volume, which is entitled "Le Système Continental", the subject receives less than four pages, about as much as is devoted to the divorce and to the Austrian marriage. It is true that Napoleon could not "make commerce manoeuvre like a regiment", but the vast ramifications of the commercial conditions forcing the industry and trade, not only of France but of Europe and America as well, into new and unaccustomed channels for more than a decade, is surely of greater significance than many of the military and diplomatic incidents treated in this chapter.

The style is clear, logical, and forceful, characterized by the presentation of concrete facts and incidents rather than by abstractions about them. The author belongs to the realistic school of historical writers. He sometimes crowds his pages with a superabundance of detail, but he is never dominated by it. Its significance is made plain. Indeed, M. Pariset is at his best in his trenchant epigrammatic summaries and interpretations: "L'Université est une hiérarchie où ceux qui enseignent sont les subordonnés passifs de ceux qui n'enseignent pas"; "L'Empire a été une fabrique des fonctionnaires". Of the civil code and the property laws, he says: "Les dispositions qui concernent ceux qui ne possèdent rien sont rares, et ne sont jamais bienveillantes. . . . En ce sens, le code n'est pas démocratique. Il est le code de la classe possédante."

The character and personality of Napoleon are brought out again and again in high lights that fascinate by their boldness. Sometimes this is done in an inimitable way by apt quotations. What an insight, for example, into Napoleon's opinions, when in anger at the Tribunat he shouted:

Ils sont là douze ou quinze métaphysiciens bons à jeter à l'eau. C'est une vermine que j'ai sur les habits. Il ne faut pas croire que je me laisserai attaquer comme Louis XVI. Je ne le souffrirai pas. . . . Je suis soldat, enfant de la Révolution. Sorti du sein du peuple, je ne souffrirai pas qu'on m'insulte comme un roi.

The organization and format of the volume is that of the earlier series on the history of France before 1789. The illustrations are

excellent. They are taken from contemporary sources for the most part, and add materially to the story of the text.

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

Histoire de France Contemporaine (LAVISSE). TOME IV., V., *La Restauration*, and *La Monarchie de Juillet*. Par S. CHARLÉTY. TOME VI., VII., *La Révolution de 1848: Le Second Empire*, and *Le Déclin de l'Empire et l'Établissement de la 3^e République*. Par CH. SEIGNOBOS. (Paris: Hachette. 1921. Pp. 400; 408; 426; 426.)

THESE four volumes, treating of the period of French history that lies between 1815—the restoration of the monarchy—and 1875—the establishment of the Third Republic—form a natural unit, falling into two main divisions. The co-operation between the two writers has been so happy that one is hardly conscious of the change of authorship as one passes from the account of the February days, with which the last volume of M. Charléty closes, to the description, in the first volume of M. Seignobos, of the organization of the provisional government that resulted from the Revolution of 1848. It is an excellent example of the possibilities of co-operation in historical writing.

Novelty could hardly be expected in the chronological *cadres* of the text, the matter naturally falling under the heads adopted as the titles of the various volumes, but there is much of novelty in the varied and comprehensive treatment of the subject-matter within these divisions. It is not simply a history of the political life of France through sixty eventful years, but a well-balanced, scholarly, and attractive description of the unfolding of the entire social life of the French people in its progress toward democracy. M. Charléty's chapter in volume IV., on "L'Avènement d'une Génération nouvelle", in which he deals with "Les Néo-libéraux, les Saint-Simoniens, les Ultramontains, les Romantiques, les Savants", his chapter on "Les Partis et la Politique Économique", in which he treats of "Le Système Prohibitif, la Production et l'Échange à l'Intérieur, la Condition des Personnes", and the two chapters on "La Vie Économique" and "L'Expansion Coloniale" in volume V.; M. Seignobos's treatment of the provisional government of 1848, with chapters on "L'Organisation du Gouvernement et du Suffrage", and "Les nouveaux Organes de la Vie Politique", the chapter on "La Distribution Régionale des Partis en France", the treatment of "La Société Française" under the chapter-heads, "La Population de la France, la Population Agricole, la Population Industrielle, les Classes Moyennes et les Classes Supérieures, le Mouvement Intellectuel", in volume VI., indicate the comprehensive treatment of the period.

The traditional topics—the successive revolutions, with the continuous struggle between the reactionary and progressive groups, together

with foreign affairs—are treated in an admirable spirit of detachment, described with freshness and color, and, not infrequently, from a new point of view, due to the utilization of recent monographs or of manuscript material. The treatment of foreign affairs under the Second Empire, in M. Seignobos's second volume, is an admirable piece of work, a model of well-balanced, scholarly exposition.

Not the least noteworthy thing in these volumes, where there is so much to commend, is the skill shown in sketching the principal characters of the period, or rather, in permitting them, through their acts and utterances, to reveal themselves. Louis XVIII., Charles X., Louis Philippe, Napoleon III. and his associates, Thiers, MacMahon, and Gambetta, are not mere abstractions, but living personalities that assume definite shape in the mind of the reader as he follows their acts and reads their statements of policy and opinion. The one thing that impresses one, when the whole gallery has been passed in review, is the mediocrity of the age, not one first-class character appearing on the scene. Thiers, his career viewed as a whole, falls short of greatness, and Gambetta, up to 1875, had not monopolized the stage.

These volumes were written before 1914 and one is especially struck by M. Seignobos's impartial attitude toward Germany and Bismarck. After recounting the facts connected with the famous Ems despatch, he defends Bismarck against the charge of "falsification". "This expression", he writes, "adopted by the French papers, is inexact; Bismarck was authorized to publish, not the *text* of Abeken's dispatch (whose form rendered it improper for publication) but the *refusal* of the king, and his text contains no false affirmation; the form alone was different." After describing the German methods of warfare—burning of villages, where German soldiers had been fired upon, shooting the natives, levying extraordinary contributions, forcing the leading men of a town to ride on a locomotive in order to protect a train from attack—M. Seignobos remarks that "this mixture of rigor and exploitation gave the French the impression of a barbarous war. In fact, the German soldiers, well-disciplined and peaceable by nature, committed few acts of violence upon persons, in proportion to the number of the invaders. They ate and drank much and burned all they could make use of to warm them in a very cold winter. They did little damage out of pure deviltry. The population, contrary to other wars, complained less of the excesses of individual soldiers than of the harshness of the officers."

In a semi-popular history of this kind the absence of original research can not be counted a defect. That the writer shall be acquainted with the latest and best monographic work is all that the critic can reasonably demand. More than that must be counted as good measure not called for in the bond. Such good measure is found, as might have been expected in the work of such mature scholars, both in the volumes of M. Charléty, writing from first-hand knowledge on the beginnings of

socialism, especially on the life and activities of Saint-Simon, and in those of M. Seignobos, drawing upon the manuscripts of the Archives Nationales for his studies on the regional distribution of parties in France.

The bibliographies are full and critical, containing not only the enumeration of printed secondary works and sources, but also the indication of some unpublished monographs and of important manuscript sources. Attention is frequently called to the lack of monographs on important topics, and a careful examination of the bibliography and of the dates of publication of the works makes clear how much virgin soil there is for the historian in this very important period of French history.

Not the least valuable part of the volumes is the illustrations. They consist chiefly of portraits, some of them full-page reproductions of the work of famous French artists, such as Gérard's portrait of Louis XVIII., Winterhalter's Louis Philippe, Mme. Desnos's Casimir Périer, Lafosse's striking lithograph of General Cavaignac, Flandrin's Napoleon III., and Bonnat's fine portraits of Thiers and Gambetta. We miss Charles X. and Guizot from the gallery. There are, also, many rare and interesting contemporary cartoons, contemporary sketches of historical scenes, and reproductions of famous paintings, to illustrate the art of the period.

FRED MORROW FLING.

Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 1815-1914. Von A. SARTORIUS VON WALTERSHAUSEN. (Jena: Gustav Fischer. 1920. Pp. x, 598. M. 50.)

A READER acquainted with Sombart's *Deutsche Volkswirtschaft im 19. Jahrhundert* will be startled to find that the present author assumes the complete lack of any comprehensive survey of the subject which he covers. How he can do this when he cites Sombart in his bibliography must be left to the German academic conscience for decision. This at least can be said for him, that the present book is considerably larger than Sombart's, is far more rich in concrete detail, and is better suited in general to the purposes of a student seeking an introduction to the recent economic history of Germany.

The author shuns the economic abstractions which make Sombart's work at the same time so attractive and so perilous. He depreciates the contributions of capitalism, and emphasizes the contributions of individual persons. He is a follower of Nietzsche and Treitschke, accepting the dominance in history of the "Wille zur Macht". Consequently he emphasizes the political element, and describes in full detail the course of public policy. He is, of course, a nationalist; the highest praise that he can bestow on the tariff of 1879 is that it was not only "national" but also "deutsch empfunden". More particularly,

he is a German Conservative, a believer in the landed aristocracy and a defender of measures taken in their behalf. Bismarck is his ideal. Of the person and character of William II. he says little, but the course of the empire under the last kaiser he describes as aimless; the period of indecision culminated in the recent war, the preparations for which were in the military aspect insufficient, in the political aspect "miserable". The United Kingdom and the United States are bitterly condemned for a selfish and brutal policy.

While the book is colored throughout by the author's general philosophy, he is, after all, primarily an economist, and when he keeps his eyes on the ground he sees clearly and describes soberly and accurately. His theory of the price changes in the middle and at the end of the nineteenth century is not one which the present writer can accept. Most of the book, however, is free from any doctrinal taints, whether political or economic. It is a matter-of-fact account of German agricultural, industrial, and commercial development, packed with interesting information.

The book begins with a survey of conditions as they were after the wars of liberation at the beginning of the century. The years 1833 and 1871 give the author his main turning-points in the course of the century; the years 1848 and 1890 are chosen to subdivide the narrative. Each of the six chapters in which the book is thus arranged has secondary divisions according to the topics treated. A table of contents, filling some five pages, aids the reader who seeks a particular subject, but it does not atone for the lack of an index; nor do the bibliographical lists appended to each chapter satisfy the reader who desires to know the authority for a certain statement but finds the book bare of foot-notes.

The author draws his material from a great variety of sources. He has employed not only official publications, standard histories and biographies, and the monographic studies of which German seminars have produced a great abundance; he has made good use also of books of description and travel, and on occasion introduces effective quotations from literature, even from the *Fliegende Blätter*.

He has had to solve a difficult problem in composition. Germany as of 1914 included territorial elements differing widely in their historical antecedents, and the author is unquestionably right in his belief that historical tradition has played a large part in the course of recent development. This is most obvious in the field of agrarian history, but is apparent everywhere. The author, therefore, has had to frame his work in an intricate plan. If, as a result, the reader is sometimes burdened by the mass of facts, the plan has merits of its own, and it is executed with some features which deserve special commendation. (1) The author often simplifies his narrative by analyzing and enumerating the most significant points; he sketches the main lines and omits

the details. (2) The statistical tables are unusually well selected to illustrate the course of development; they are brief and general. (3) The author has contrived often to combine nice discrimination with brevity of treatment; an illustration is his discussion of the effects of the Continental System of the Napoleonic period. (4) The book contains many striking little bits of information: statistical comparison of foreign trade, 1825 and 1913 (p. 51); functions of the early banks and the place of the Jews in banking (pp. 57, 277); the part of the Germans in the early expositions at Berlin and Paris (pp. 74, 174); description of leading stores and factories (pp. 142, 190); and so forth. The reader will notice a perversion of some English names (Arkwrigh, Cartwrigh, Wegwood), and occasional slips in the tables of figures (pp. 53, 364), but will find the presswork on the whole well done.

CLIVE DAY.

The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France: a Study in the History of Social Politics. By PARKER THOMAS MOON, Instructor in History in Columbia University.¹ (New York: Macmillan Company. 1921. Pp. xiv, 473. \$3.25.)

THE purpose of this interesting and valuable book is to relate the history of the French side of Socialism, which the author describes as a nearly world-wide force "comparable in magnitude and in power to international Socialism, or to Syndicalism, or to the co-operative movement" (p. vii). This powerful force, the author declares, deserves more attention than it has hitherto received in England and the United States. It is both a social philosophy and an organized movement of vast proportions. Like its rivals, Socialism and Syndicalism, it offers and works for the realization of a programme for the solution of the labor problem created by the Industrial Revolution. This solution is based on the application of long-recognized ethical principles to modern industrial problems. It expects to attain its goal by "a bold organic reorganization of the existing industrial system and of existing democratic institutions, rather than by cautious compromises and palliatives" (p. 5). Though the author nowhere lays any stress upon the point, his account clearly indicates that the most active promoters of Social Catholicism, along with a strong desire for the improvement of the condition of the working classes, have drawn much inspiration from a confident belief that, if success crowns their efforts, there will accrue to the Roman Catholic Church a great increase of power and influence.

The book falls into three nearly equal parts. Chapters I.-V. describe the antecedents of the movement to 1870, its organization under the inspiring leadership of Count de Mun and the development of its programme from 1871 to 1891, the foreign influences which most affected it, and the differences between the vanguard led by Count de Mun

¹ Now assistant professor *ibid.*

and the stragglers, represented by Bishop Freppel and his followers. Chapters VI.-IX. trace in detail the effect upon the movement of papal intervention by Leo XIII., especially in his Encyclical Letter of May 15, 1891, on the condition of the working classes, and his famous letter of February 16, 1892, urging upon French Catholics acceptance of the Third Republic. In this part the most striking feature is a detailed and illuminating account of the origin, composition, and activities of the Popular Liberal Party, the most powerful and significant organization which has developed in connection with the Social Catholic movement in France. Chapters X.-XII. furnish a contemporary survey of the movement, describe the dissident groups, and set forth the author's conclusions.

In general and in nearly all particulars the work of the author has been well done. A vast amount of widely scattered material has been carefully examined. The results are set forth in clear and interesting fashion. In a commendable endeavor to appeal to a larger public than is usually secured for a doctor's dissertation, the documentation has been relegated to the end of the book. To the reviewer it appears questionable whether the gain has not been more than counterbalanced by a propensity to put into the text considerable matter which might better have gone into the notes.

Aside from points of detail, the reviewer has only two considerable criticisms to make. The extent to which Social Catholicism has actually been an effective factor in bringing about the social legislation of the Third Republic is not very clearly indicated. The author rather assumes that because the movement has been large and active it has therefore been an effective force. Its opponents, especially the anti-clericals and socialists, claim for themselves nearly all the credit for the social legislation actually enacted. An examination of these rival claims would have added greatly to the value of the book. The anti-clericals are not always treated fairly; for them there is an undertone of detraction, often implied rather than expressed, and an assumption that their attitude was due to unworthy motives. Justice to them requires recognition that, whatever their faults, they were striving for the public welfare as they conceived it. At the same time the shortcomings of the Catholics in such matters as the Boulanger and Dreyfus affairs are passed over very lightly. Despite these faults, the book, taken as a whole, is a notable contribution to knowledge.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

Europe since 1870. By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER, Ph.D., Professor of European History in the University of Michigan. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Company. 1921. Pp. xii, 580. \$3.00.)

For the second time within a few months we have from the pen of

Professor Turner a work of merit on modern European history. The first traced European development from the beginning of the French Revolution through the close of the World War. The second aims to treat with similar breadth the period of fifty years from the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War to the present day.

Until he has reached chapter VI., however, the author does not take his main theme directly in hand. To his introductory discussion he gives the first five chapters, occupying 123 of the 548 pages in the volume, a seemingly disproportionate amount of space for this purpose, especially when one considers how freighted with momentous events and profoundly significant changes are the years since 1870.

These opening chapters include an account of the Old Régime, of the topography of Europe, of the French Revolution, a chapter of twenty-five pages on the Industrial Revolution, and another of twenty-six pages on intellectual and social changes before 1870. But all of these matters, and many others too, which are included, do not seem requisite to an adequate introduction to the history of Europe since 1870. True it is, that these chapters are splendidly done, and some parts of them helpful in the highest degree, others indispensable even, to an understanding of the subsequent presentation. Had such valuable and essential features, however, been combined in one, or at most, two introductory chapters, and the space thus saved devoted to the history of Europe since 1918, the title of the book would fit its contents with greater exactitude. When the general reader, teacher, or student, purchases a book entitled *Europe since 1870*, he has the right to expect that he shall find therein information concerning events and conditions in Europe down to the beginning of the present year at least. But it is just here that Professor Turner disappoints us. As far as this volume is concerned, European history since 1870 ends approximately with the year 1918, save for the settlement made by the Peace Conference during 1919, which subject receives adequate treatment (chapter XVIII.). Certainly the reader can rightfully demand that a work bearing the above title, and appearing in the autumn of 1921, should tell whether a League of Nations was actually organized, what states belong to it, what it has done, if anything; should give more than three lines to the new government of Germany; should give at least a brief account of developments in the various European states since November, 1918. Concerning these and many other subjects upon which we should like instruction by a trained and scholarly historian, Professor Turner gives little more information than in his former volume, *Europe, 1789-1920*, published early last year.

The two volumes, perhaps of necessity, closely resemble each other. The second, indeed, is part two of the first, largely reprinted, but expanded by the addition of 109 pages to the author's original treatment of the period extending from Germany's military triumphs in 1864-

1870 to the close of the World War; and with the five introductory chapters already mentioned, which consist largely, though not wholly, of material also found in the earlier work, but here adapted, remodelled and reorganized to fit the later.

Occasional statements occur in this volume, as in the earlier one, to which exception may fairly be taken. For example, the author says in reference to the Germans: "They undertook to cut the communications of the allies and starve England out by sinking all allied ships by means of submarines" (p. 478). As the Germans also used their submarines to attack neutral ships, and actually did sink approximately 1,800,000 gross tons of neutral shipping, ought there not to be some indication of these facts in the above statement? Concerning the number of deaths in battle, we read: "The number of men killed was estimated at 9,000,000 . . ." (p. 525). But the figures of both French and American officials range from 7,500,000 to 7,600,000.

This volume is not based on research, nor can it be considered a new and suggestive discussion in any essential respect. It is, nevertheless, a valuable and useful work. It is unequalled as a text-book for use in courses on the World War, where a preliminary study of the antecedents and causes of the struggle is deemed desirable. It is superior in this respect to the other treatises on nineteenth-century Europe, as those of Hayes, Hazen, Schapiro, and Holt and Chilton, and better even than Seymour's *Diplomatic Background of the War*, because broader in scope. It is clear, well organized, contains a huge store of essential information, omits details without leaving the story vague and meaningless, covers every important phase of European civilization, and is admirable on international relations and events leading to the war.

EARL EVELYN SPERRY.

Russian Dissenters. By FREDERICK C. CONYBEARE. (Harvard Theological Studies, vol. X.) (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1921. Pp. x, 370. \$4.00.)

BUT little has been written in Western Europe on the religious life in Russia. I mean real research work, not half-fantastic pictures such as that of Stephen Graham. One of the most interesting problems of Russian religious life which has always attracted the attention of Western Europe is the problem of the "Dissenters" (Raskolniki) and of the different sects both rationalistic and mystic, according to the usual classification. Much has been written on this subject in Russia. Careful studies of the written sources, careful collections of oral evidence have been printed, and yet some basic questions remain still unsolved. The time for a serene and unbiassed solution of the problem is not yet come. Until the last revolution, the state and the ruling church kept on persecuting the dissenters and the sectarians and trying

to explain their attitude toward them in various official, semi-official, and private publications. On the other hand the Russian liberals took decidedly the side of the dissenters and sectarians.

One of the main problems as regards the dissenters is how to explain their schism and their bitter fight against the official Niconian church. Was it purely a matter of religion, or one of the signs of the decisive break between the main population of Russia and the intellectuals, or one of the forms of social and political struggle? On the other hand the main problem regarding the sectarians is: have we to regard them as a result of a Western influence on the Russian religious life, superficial and temporary, or is it a peculiar product of the Russian religious evolution, bringing back some of the most ancient currents of the early Christian and perhaps pre-Christian religious life of mankind in general?

We must welcome therefore the publication of a serious unbiassed study on this subject by a prominent student of the history of religions in general. I have not to introduce Dr. Conybeare to the readers of the *Review*. He is well known as one of the students of the Christian faith in general, whose knowledge is based not only on a careful study of documents written in different languages but also on extended travels which brought him occasionally to Russia also. I do not know how far he is acquainted with the Russian language. The translations from the Russian given in his book are generally correct although the same words and expressions which are translated in some parts correctly are grossly misunderstood in others.¹ Is it not due to the use of several different secretaries? To the same use of secretaries I am inclined to ascribe many repetitions and a peculiar structure of the whole work. Instead of giving the facts as he understands them, Dr. Conybeare generally gives extensive quotations from Russian books which very often repeat the same facts but generally from different points of view. It is awkward to read a passage of Ivanovski, a defender of the official point of view, followed by a quotation from Usov, a strong supporter of the idea that the Raskols represent a social and political movement, and a quotation from Miliukov, who is of the opinion that the Raskol was a reaction of Old Russia against the new one. From a historian we should expect not an apposition but a critical selection of ascertained facts.²

There is the same uncertainty in his judgment about the Raskol.

¹ See, e.g., p. 104: "This was the establishment of a hospital for the sick called the Kladbich in the village of Rogozh"; Kladbische means in Russian cemetery; later on C. gives quite a good description of this Rogozhskoe Kladbische. Many times C. speaks of the province of Nizhegorod meaning the province of Nizhnii-Novgorod, but towards the end of the book he again gives the correct form, etc.

² I regret also that no index is appended to the book. Every author should know that a book without an index will perhaps be read, but never consulted.

Of course Dr. Conybeare is far from supporting the official optimism of Ivanovski. He sympathizes both with the dissidents and with the sectarians, as almost everybody in Russia does, but I have been unable to find that he gives a definite answer to the main question: how to explain the Raskol. In his introductory chapter he seems to insist on the political and social side of the struggle, following Usov; on p. 262 he adopts the view of Miliukov, which is generally accepted by the leading Russian historians (Kliuchevski, Platonov, etc.). I have been surprised by the way not to find any mention of the views of Kliuchevski, whose treatment of the Raskol forms one of the most brilliant parts of his history of Russia. More definite are the views of Dr. Conybeare on the sects and, while his dealing with the Raskol has not brought forward the question of its nature (except in some minor points), his treatment of the sects is both interesting and stimulating. Here he appears to be in his own domain, and shows with full evidence how closely connected are the Russian sects with many analogous movements in the early history of Christianity.

It was not my intention in pointing out some minor defects of this book to question its value and its importance. There is not very much that is new to Russian scholars, as the study is based on secondary sources, but it should be read by every scholar in America and Western Europe who is interested in religious problems. Russia's religious evolution is as peculiar and as full of interesting phenomena as is everything in the historical evolution of that land.

M. ROSTOVTSSEFF.

Portraits of the Nineties. By E. T. RAYMOND. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1921. Pp. 319. \$4.50.)

FOLLOWING in the footsteps of McCarthy, Russell, and Hutchinson, who have drawn for us the portraits of the English sixties, seventies, and eighties, Mr. Raymond essays a similar task for the final decade of the century. Few will deny his success. His tone is sympathetic and appreciative, a cheering contrast to the mordant criticism of Mr. Keynes and the "Gentleman with the Duster". His appreciation, however, is discriminating and the cloying eulogies of the old-fashioned biographical sketch are wholly lacking. Like most biographical essayists of the moment he seeks, rather too overtly perhaps, to make his impression through humor. Some of his epigrams seem labored; he is often too obviously in search of an anecdote, which sometimes serves and sometimes does not serve to characterize his subject. But of true wit there is not a little, and by his wealth of literary and biographical allusion he has imparted a flavor of nineteenth-century "culture" which more than anything else helps to explain the personalities he presents. He recalls the nineties as, on the whole, a golden age.

The sun shone brighter in those days; the east wind was less

bitter; . . . The steaks were juicier; the landladies were a kindlier race. There was a zest and flavor in life lacking today. Youth was emancipated from the harsher kind of parental control and had not yet found a stern step-father in the State. The world was all before it where to choose and the future was veiled in a rose-colored mist. Such is the atmosphere of the book.

Mr. Raymond has dealt with a host of personalities. No less than twenty-eight are portrayed in separate chapters, while in the final three he brings together groups of lawyers, journalists, and actors for our inspection. The majority of his portraits are of political leaders and his choice would coincide in general with popular judgment; the reader perhaps might be surprised by the inclusion of such men as Earl Spencer, Lord Courtney of Penwith, and Sir Henry Fowler, and by the omission of Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Ritchie, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, to none of whom has the reviewer been able to discover even an allusion. Cecil Rhodes naturally finds a place, as do Archbishop Temple and Mandell Creighton, Oscar Wilde and Thomas Hardy, artists such as Leighton and Watts, journalists such as Stead, evangelists such as Spurgeon and Booth. The book is in no sense a biographical dictionary; the author avoids dates except as the age of the men under discussion happens to affect their position. There is little of the detailed facts of their careers, which are sketched rapidly and broadly.

In general, popular judgment has been accepted and re-enforced. The writer has little use for the expert analyst who, because of his presence behind the scenes, claims to make final judgment; he puts his confidence in the opinion of the gallery rather than in that of the green-room. "On the whole", he says, "the gallery knows a good play when it sees it and is more than any other part of the house free from the many cranky prepossessions of the moment. . . . It may be too generous when it claps and a trifle unjust when it hisses, but it is honest in both moods." The author is not so much interested, therefore, in a searching analysis of his characters, as he is in showing the impression they made upon their age and what their contemporaries thought of them. "When we can be sure of doing perfect justice in the simplest police case we may begin to talk about the infallibility of a tribunal of pedants. . . . Carry analysis to the length of an autopsy and hero and scoundrel look very much alike." Broadly speaking, then, Mr. Raymond's book is a picture of public opinion rather than a gallery of personalities. It will yield no concrete material for the future doctoral dissertation. It is filled with suggestions, however, and ought not to be neglected by anyone interested in the social and political chronicles of England, particularly of London, at the close of the Victorian era.

French Foreign Policy from Fashoda to Serajevo (1898-1914). By GRAHAM H. STUART, Ph.D. (New York: Century Company, 1921. Pp. xii, 392. \$3.00.)

A SKETCH of the diplomatic position of France in the Europe of 1898 is the background against which Dr. Stuart outlines the development of French policy at Fashoda, at the first Hague Conference, and during the Boer War. His third chapter reviews French interests (1898-1905) in Turkey, Crete, and Siam, and in the Boxer uprising in China; his fourth treats of relations with Italy and the Vatican. Under the heading *Entente Cordiale* he traces at some length the growth of Anglo-French accord through the problems of the Bagdad railway, African difficulties, and the Russo-Japanese war. Six chapters on the Moroccan question—European rivalries, the fall of Delcassé, Algerias, Franco-German rivalry, 1907-1909, the Failure of the 1909 Settlement, and Agadir—form the heart of the book and contain, perhaps, its most important contribution. The final chapter leads Towards the World War. Although the heading does not necessarily imply a comprehensive treatment, many important developments from 1911 to 1914 are omitted; there is no discussion, for example, of French policy with reference to Belgium or the question of neutrality; no adequate attention is given to the Anglo-French naval understanding or to the Caillaux case and its international background. With respect to the rest of the book this chapter is foreshortened and the termination is distinctly weak. No attempt is made to carry the story beyond Serajevo.

Morocco is rightly emphasized as a very significant feature of French foreign policy, 1904-1914, but it would seem that the book as a whole has been worked up as a setting for a study of this subject, rather than to give a thorough, well proportioned presentation of the course of French diplomacy within the limits set. Certainly, important aspects have been overlooked or sacrificed to make way for the Moroccan problem. Relations with Russia throughout the period 1904-1914, the Bosnian crisis, the Tripolitan affair and, in general, Mediterranean interests have not been given sufficient emphasis. Problems such as the attitude of France during the Spanish-American War and the real inwardness of the French position during the Boer War have not really been attacked.

In form, Dr. Stuart's presentation is clear and readable; in content, it is on the whole an admirable recasting and elaboration of many of those expositions which were so hastily prepared, during the early days of the war, for the enlightenment of the American public. As a manual for the general reader and the college student it will be a convenient synthesis. And yet its extensive documentation argues, possibly, a more ambitious intent. For a well-rounded piece of scholarship the book is obviously too big in scope and too small in compass. The French point of view is over-developed in proportion to the attention

given to other angles of consideration. Although the author is generally moderate in his conclusions and treatment, his sympathies are apparent; he has drawn his material too exclusively from French sources. An extensive acquaintance with French official documents is demonstrated but there are no signs that many excellent secondary books have been exploited—particularly German books. The recent books of Eckardstein, Schwertfeger, Hammann and Friedjung have much of general importance to contribute to a study of this kind. It is strange that no reference is made, in presenting the Moroccan question, to the work of Closs, Zimmermann, Diercks, or Wirth, not to mention the books of the Frenchmen, Bernard and Gourdin.

A bibliography of eight pages, although not announced as comprehensive, ought, in a book of this character, to contain some critique, and it should not omit so many obvious titles; at least all books cited in the text should be included. Cases in point are Jaray, *La Politique Franco-Anglaise*, cited p. 109, note 23, and Millet, *Notre Politique Extérieure*, cited p. 121, note 49. There are many similar omissions in the index.

LAURENCE BRADFORD PACKARD.

My Memoirs. By Prince LUDWIG WINDISCHGRAETZ. Translated by Constance Vesey. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1921. Pp. 356. \$5.00.)

FROM three of the most important statesmen in Austria-Hungary during the war we now have valuable personal narratives written in the time of their downfall or exile—Czernin, Andrassy, and Windischgraetz. From a fourth, greater than any of this trio, we shall probably have nothing, for Stephan Tisza was assassinated on the flagstones of his own baronial hall at the very close of the war, just as the rotten fabric of the Hapsburg monarchy was falling to pieces. Czernin's *In the World War* is valuable for its inside information on the Brest-Litovsk and other diplomatic negotiations which he conducted as foreign minister until his fall in 1917; but as an apologia it is hardly convincing. Julius Andrassy's *Diplomatie und Weltkrieg* analyzes with clear penetration, almost with philosophic calm, the complex internal conditions in the Dual Monarchy into which he had been initiated by his more famous father; with his clear grasp of the situation it was probably unfortunate that he lacked that political ambition and passion for action, of which most of his fellow-Magyar aristocrats had an excess, and so did not finally become foreign minister until October 25, 1918—when it was too late to salvage any of the wreckage. Of these three volumes of memoirs, the most valuable to the historian is unquestionably that of Prince Windischgraetz, because of its greater length, its vividness, and the diary-like detailed accounts of the telephone messages, secret meetings, and journeys of its tireless author.

Prince Ludwig Windischgraetz, grandson of the field-marshal who suppressed revolution in Vienna in 1848 and son of one of the highest officers in the old army, by birth and social position belonged to the circle of distinguished, powerful, and narrow-minded Magyar aristocrats. But in his strenuous youth he had learned that there was a world beyond Tokay and that he was no longer living in the age of feudalism. As military attaché with the tsar's troops in the Russo-Japanese War he was captured at Fakumen, but set at liberty by the Japanese. In New York he was ambushed by thieves, fired upon a mulatto, and had to spend the night in jail. After lion-hunting in Africa and other travels he returned to restore the prosperity of his ancestral vineyards in Hungary, married Maria Széchenyi, and "plunged into the petty arena of Hungarian county politics with my head full of world political theories and studies which embraced every quarter of the globe" (p. 23). But this life did not satisfy his fiery energy. In the annexation crisis of 1908, disguising himself as a machinist and waiter, he collected secret information in Serbia. During the following months of calm before the storm he constantly attacked Berchtold (a cousin of his wife's) for his vacillation and incompetence. In 1914 this stormy petrel was only thirty-two years old, but he had learned to look beyond a policy of petty intrigue, and to recognize, as Sir Robert Hart had once told him in China, that "European policy must keep in view an area extending from Vladivostok to the Rhine".

The greater part of Windischgraetz's memoirs is the story of the fight he made, during the war, against the "system", the autocratic clique of corrupt and incompetent military and diplomatic officials who had plunged the Dual Monarchy into a war which they did not know how to conduct effectively. But for three years, while he was serving most of the time at the front, he could do little but protest against the unwise orders which came from the military clique. The Austrian Supreme Command was often working at cross purposes with the Austrian Foreign Office; to one of his protests he received the classic reply, "The Foreign Office must not know what policy the Supreme Command is pursuing" (p. 96)! In contrast to his contempt for the Austrian Supreme Command is his admiration for the efficiency of Emperor William's officers on the southeastern front; yet he was equally opposed to Burian's foreign policy, "which was characterized from the very first by indiscriminating and slavish recognition of German control" (p. 101).

After the death of Francis Joseph some of the Supreme Command, who were more concerned with military decorations than service at the front, were dismissed. At the Ballhausplatz Burian gave way to Czernin, and Tisza yielded the Hungarian premiership to Wekerle. Finally, in October, 1917, Windischgraetz himself was appointed Hun-

garian food minister, an office which he apparently filled with great energy and success. He now won the esteem of Emperor Charles, became one of his most intimate advisers, and secured his theoretical approval for a wide-reaching programme of reform which Windischgraetz laid before him in May, 1918; an unequivocal statement to Germany of Austria's absolute inability to carry on the war longer; an immediate separate peace with the Entente if Germany insisted on continuing the war; autonomy for the subject nationalities (except Galicia which was to be ceded to Poland); and universal suffrage in Hungary. But Charles had not the courage to put this programme into practical effect—until it was too late. Windischgraetz and Szilassy both think the Monarchy and much of its territory could have been saved if the emperor had acted on this programme at once. This however is very doubtful; at least it must remain one of the unsolved "ifs" of history. When at last Charles did act on Windischgraetz's advice by appointing Julius Andrássy as foreign minister (Oct. 25), the débâcle had already begun. National councils had been set up in Prag, Agram, and Buda-Pesth; Germany was in retreat in France; and the Italians were breaking through in the South. In Hungary Andrássy's own son-in-law, Károlyi, driven by ambition, treacherously deceived his father and dethroned his emperor. Windischgraetz, who remained loyal to Charles and was one of those who shared in his second ill-starred effort to return to the Hungarian throne in October, 1921, is very bitter against Károlyi; perhaps he paints his perfidy too black. Here, and in some other passages, his statements must probably be taken *cum grano salis*.

Nowhere is there a better account than in this spirited book of why and how the Dual Monarchy at last collapsed.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

Life of Venizelos. By S. B. CHESTER (Chester of Wethersfield and Blary), with a Letter from His Excellency M. Venizelos. (New York: George H. Doran Company. 1921. Pp. xvi, 321. \$6.00.)

MR. CHESTER has had exceptional advantages in the performance of his task. In addition to five friends of the statesman, among them his permanent secretary, to whom he expresses his obligations (add Mr. Leonard Magnus, p. 305, note), M. Venizelos himself "found time . . . to enlighten me [the author] upon various matters connected with his life and work" (p. vii), and, indeed, in the introductory letter states that he read that part of the book which deals with the Cretan Question (p. vi). We may, therefore, regard the present biography as being in a sense "inspired", a circumstance which should guarantee it an unusual value among books of the kind, and in particular may assume that the record of the Cretan imbroglio, which is here presented at considerable length, gives an unusually accurate account of this confused period from the point of view of the chief actor therein; and these chapters

contain what is probably the book's most valuable contribution to knowledge.

One other point, the precise bearing and implications of which are, I confess, not altogether clear to me, ought, perhaps, for the sake of the critical student of history, to be recorded in this context. In the same introductory letter M. Venizelos writes, "So far, I have declined to read manuscripts of books sent to me and dealing with myself and I could not make an exception in your case." This statement appears to be somewhat at variance with that of Mr. H. A. Gibbons, "Much of the story has come from Premier Venizelos himself and from M. Politis, Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs since 1917. These main actors in the regeneration of Greece have been gracious enough to read my manuscript and call my attention to errors of fact" (*Venizelos*, 1920, pp. x ff.).

The composition is lucid, and there are numerous but not wearisome quotations from conversations and documents of all kinds, but unfortunately the sources for these are seldom given. A marked vivacity of style helps to sustain interest during the bewildering mazes of intrigue and negotiations, but leads to occasional lapses from dignity, as in the case of some pretty sorry puns (pp. 190, 193, 239), and the rather overdone comparison of King Constantine with a balky mule, flinging itself upon the ground and raising a "cloud of dust and dirt" (pp. 233 ff.), a variety of *jeu d'esprit* which historians might perhaps better leave to the cartoonist's less rigorous sense of decorum.

Regarded as biography, the most noteworthy weakness of the sketch is the failure to present effectively those substantial and charming traits of intellect, character, and bearing, so brilliantly set forth, for example, by Mr. Gibbons (*op. cit.*, pp. 162 ff.), which make M. Venizelos, undoubtedly one of the world's greatest statesmen, also perhaps its most engaging public personality. Mr. Chester's treatment of this theme evinces inexperience in the delineation of character, and a tendency at times to descend to the trivial. Thus the formidable list of French wines which "would" or would not "probably appeal to him" might properly have given place to more significant traits of individuality.

Considered as history, the present work gives adequate consideration, indeed, to the military and especially the political aspects of M. Venizelos's career, but there is hardly more than a mention of his masterly programme of educational, economic, and social reforms. These constitute the substantial basis upon which alone could have been erected the brilliant diplomatic and military achievements which, although for the time being they focus attention upon themselves, will, in the juster perspective of the future, without doubt occupy a distinctly less conspicuous position. Even in politics Mr. Chester omits some important facts that constitute an integral part of the story, and treats others with a euphemism and optimism which, if taken at their face value, would leave one simply bewildered at the lamely explained, but by no means

inexplicable, upheaval of the election of November, 1920. The present work cannot, therefore, escape wholly the charge of a measure of partizanship, and that is the more unfortunate because the subject of it himself and the large outlines of his public policy hold so secure a place in history and the respect of mankind that they have relatively little to fear from an impartial and even critical examination of the complete record. King Constantine's basic political error seems to have been that he, together with the General Staff, believed the war would end in a stalemate—surely a not unreasonable conjecture before the entry of America—but of his devotion to what he believed to be the best interests of his people, and of the confidence which great numbers of them have in his integrity, there can hardly exist a reasonable doubt. The prolonged struggle between the king and the statesman over the methods by which Greece was to be best served is no doubt still too recent to allow on either side the magnanimous treatment of an adversary; but now that Constantine, in striving manfully to achieve the long overdue redemption of the Hellenes of Western Asia Minor, is but executing the policy conceived and inaugurated by Venizelos, it is perhaps not too quixotic to hope that, forgetting the past, they may find a basis for reconciliation in a united effort to safeguard the future of the nation.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

The New World of Islam. By LOTHROP STODDARD, A.M., Ph.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1921. Pp. vii, 362. \$3.00.)

BETWEEN journalism and history lies a debatable ground, having to do with the most recent or "current" events. The journalist stands on the field of time at that advancing line called the present which separates the partly known past from the wholly unknown future. His first concern, as new events are disclosed, is rapid recognition, approximate discernment, and tentative description. He is not held by his own conscience, or the demands of his readers, to the highest attainable measure of accuracy, perspective, and insight. The historian, on the other hand, is less concerned with promptness than with the desire to record reliably what has indubitably happened, and to interpret it with some measure of finality. Not long since he often scorned to deal with affairs of the latest quarter-century, on the ground that adequate materials could not in that time become available for constructing a narrative worthy to be called history. With more rapid publication of documents and reporting of facts (here he is greatly indebted to the journalist), and under the pressure of present-day demands for timeliness and practical service, the historian ventures progressively nearer to the present.

European countries have developed, and America is beginning to

produce, an intermediate group, the publicists, who might be described as historians of current events, or as historical journalists. They write carefully considered editorials, periodical articles, and books, in which they endeavor to interpret the most recent events. They are frequently tempted by popular demand, the rewards of successful trials, and the excitement of watching the onrush of events, to essay another rôle, that of anticipating or "forecasting" the future. The American public welcomes the writings of the publicists, but is somewhat suspicious of them, partly because of possessing too little information and background to distinguish propagandists, sensation-mongers, and would-be prophets from serious and scientific writers, and partly because it is pleasanter to assume that the world is settled and running smoothly than to give attention to the endless movements, machinations, intrigues, and readjustments which mingle with the elements of every complex of human activities.

Mr. Stoddard writes as a publicist who wishes to be as nearly as possible a historian. There is nothing in the present volume to bear out the charge which has been brought against some of his other writings of alarmist intentions. He keeps admirably to his own dictum: "All that we may wisely venture is to observe, describe, and analyze the various elements in the great transition" (p. 355); this summarizing of the present situation in the Islamic world as a "great transition" is clearly in harmony with the facts. He scrupulously avoids prediction, except of a very guarded and general character (pp. 156, 295, for example). He refrains from affirmations of certainty where none can be attained, as when he balances, sometimes by quoting contrary opinions, the questions of the moral right behind benevolently directed imperialism (p. 98), and of the present fitness of Asiatics for self-government (pp. 143 ff.).

The first quarter of the book is introductory, containing such a brief general sketch of Mohammedan history as is believed to be necessary in all books on the Near and Middle East. Mr. Stoddard handles this vividly and freshly, and proceeds to a somewhat more detailed account of Pan-Islamism, which he holds to have begun in its modern form with the Wahabi movement, and to sum up so wide a range of movements, political, religious, educational, missionary, etc., as to amount almost to a Mohammedan Renaissance. The thesis of the remainder of the book is to estimate the effect, up to the present moment, of western influence upon Islam. This is no simple task, involving many more or less self-conscious peoples, distributed from Morocco to India, ruled in various ways by native or alien governments, and moved toward evolution or revolution by several more or less separate groups of western influences. It would perhaps be too much to expect evenness of treatment. The political side is handled best, with especial examination of the nationalist movements in Persia, Turkey, Egypt, India, and Arabia. A number of leaders little known to the West are introduced,

with sketches of their lives and epitomes of their ideas: for example, Djemal-ed-Din el-Afghani (pp. 63 ff.) and Mustapha Kamel (pp. 179 ff., not Mustapha Kemal, who is also characterized, pp. 226 ff., and is confused with the former in the index); the discrimination of personalities and movements is in general clearly and effectively done. The chapters on economic and social change are less successful, consisting too much of insufficiently digested compilation and quotation, failing in completeness as surveys of all the Islamic countries, and showing too little organic connection with the main subject. Religious and cultural changes are not separately considered, but receive incidental attention. Pan-Turanism and Hindu nationalism are held to be so interwoven with Islam as to require a place in the book. Perhaps disproportionate space is given to the peculiar situation in India, where, under the small group of skilfully governing Englishmen, a numerous and proud Mohammedan community lives among thrice as many non-Moslems, also proud, and eager for a change in certain directions.

Mr. Stoddard's estimate of the historical rôle played by Turks and Mongols is at the lowest extreme: "Their object was not conquest for settlement, not even loot, but in great part a sheer satanic lust for blood and destruction" (p. 17); Léon Cahun sees more method in their madness. The description of Moslem conditions in the eighteenth century is perhaps too dark (pp. 25 ff.). It would be more accurate to say that the Young Turkish Revolution of 1908 followed, than that it preceded, Persian action (p. 68). The reference to 32,000,000 deaths from famine in India during 1919 is not correct (p. 262). Mr. Stoddard is unsympathetic, as are Americans generally, with many of the methods of twentieth-century European imperialism in Asia. His analysis, in the last chapter, of the effect of Bolshevism upon Islam is clear and moderate. His style is often striking and effective, as when he speaks of "an East, torn by the conflict between new and old, facing a West riven with dissension and sick with its mad follies" (p. 129). The book is as a whole remarkably illuminating and reliable; nevertheless many of the facts related may be surprising to readers who have not followed closely the course of events in the Orient.

A map of the Old World is used to show the extreme limit attained by Moslem political rule, and within it the "solid Mohammedan population of the present day"; the latter phrase is not strictly accurate, since there is some admixture of Christians, Jews, etc., in much of the area so designated. Numerous footnotes contain brief explanations and a large number of bibliographical references. Judging from these, the material used has been mainly books and periodicals in English and French.

ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Norse Discoverers of America: The Vinland Sagas. Translated and discussed by G. M. GATHORNE-HARDY, F.R.G.S. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1921. Pp. 304. 14s.)

SINCE Nansen's slashing attempt, in 1911, to rob the Vinland sagas of their historical reliability, four important works on the Norse voyages have appeared, none of which have shown any disposition to accept his chief contentions. These works are by Hovgaard (1914), Fossum (1918), Steensby (1918), and the volume under consideration. Only one of these investigators (Steensby, of Denmark) agrees with the Scandinavian scholars Storm and Jonsson that the Saga of Erik the Red is a more reliable record than the so-called Greenland narrative of the Flat Island Book. Fossum and Gathorne-Hardy believe with Hovgaard that "both accounts . . . may probably be considered as essentially historic and essentially of equal value". It must be admitted that these three open-minded investigators, without any pretensions to expertness in textual criticism, and relying largely on common sense, the contents of the sagas, and detailed knowledge concerning the north Atlantic lands and coast-lines, give the philologists a hard run; while Nansen, with a wealth of research in a dozen fields of learning involved in the Vinland controversy, is definitively vanquished. Gathorne-Hardy deftly contends, in his common-sense way, that "the successful colonization of Greenland is an historical fact, and its story is chronicled in precisely those sagas which are here under consideration with regard to Wineland". This general refutation is followed up by a detailed and comprehensive investigation, presented in such an eminently fair and reasonable spirit, that the critical reader is led to believe that the final verdict on the vexed questions of this controversy, where specialized knowledge in so many fields has been invoked, will be given by laymen.

So far as the essential historicity of the Vinland sagas is concerned, Mr. Gathorne-Hardy, erudite in Old Norse historical lore, and with ample geographical knowledge, makes a distinctive contribution by piecing and dovetailing the two discordant sagas into one harmonious story—seemingly a hazardous process from the standpoint of the average scholar, but the result is effective and convincing. Nothing is lost to the reader, however, as the eliminated parts are gathered in an appendix, following the reconstructed story. Professor Hovgaard seems to have first suggested this dovetailing process, but Mr. Gathorne-Hardy has executed it without any suggestion from his predecessor.

Though the four authors cited above agree in being convinced of the historical accuracy of the Vinland sagas in their main features, they come to pronounced disagreement on the question of the landfall of the voyagers. Steensby (a professor of geography in the University

of Copenhagen) and Fossum (an American philologist) both contend for the lands on either side of the estuary of the St. Lawrence River, making very plausible arguments; while both Hovgaard and Gathorne-Hardy place the most southerly points reached within the boundaries of the United States, the former placing the ultimate point in Rhode Island, while the latter pushes on to the western end of Long Island and the mouth of the Hudson River.

This disagreement seems to indicate that the problem of establishing a landfall is unsolved and unsolvable. And Gathorne-Hardy, despite the detailed presentation of his argument, concedes in his introduction that "the geographical details can probably never be settled with absolute finality".

Apart from the question of the landfall, the volume in hand is a readable and convincing book on the actualities of the Vinland voyages. It has both an adequate bibliography and an excellent index.

JULIUS E. OLSON.

John Wentworth, Governor of New Hampshire 1767-1775. By LAWRENCE SHAW MAYO. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1921. Pp. xi, 208. \$5.00.)

JOHN WENTWORTH, last royal governor of New Hampshire, represents the attractive New England gentleman of colonial days, well-born, well-bred, well-balanced, in that charming, somewhat aristocratic circle of well-to-do Portsmouth and Exeter families who lived large lives in small towns whose Main Street led to the open sea.

One is tempted to apply to this excellent biography what Wentworth, in his ponderous eighteenth-century style, wrote to Jeremy Belknap on returning the latter's manuscript of the first chapter of the *History of New Hampshire*: "Your care in the composition disappoints the ambition of critical examination, and gratifies the more pleasing candour of friendship. Both combine in justifying my declaration that I cannot suggest an amendment."

The manuscript and printed sources have been used with discrimination; and where the reviewer has been able to examine the originals, he finds himself much in the position of Wentworth toward Belknap, and therefore unable to follow the author's modest request in his disarming preface, that the reader "will give me the benefit of his keener perception if he finds that I have been misleading". In the discussion of Wentworth's relation with his opponents, his correspondence with President Wheelock, and his attitude on the eve of the American Revolution, the author reflects something of the governor's own poise and balance in his judgments of men and situations, his wise reserves where the evidence is incomplete, his open candor which makes one feel that there is nothing suppressed.

The chapter on the Church and the College is admirable in temper

and illuminating in treatment, and it was worth while to bring out frankly the governor's Anglican tendencies; but there was, on the whole, more of co-operation than of distrust between Wentworth and Wheelock. The Wheelock correspondence does not seem to bear out the conclusion of the chapter: "probably the President of Dartmouth College felt more relief than he would have liked to admit when the outbreak of the American Revolution put an end to the ecclesiastical manoeuvres of Governor Wentworth." More in accord with the correspondence and the facts seems the conclusion of Chase: "the most serious blow that the college suffered by the change was the loss of its powerful and disinterested friend, Governor Wentworth." (*History of Dartmouth College*, I. 318.) In the very document cited by the author, a careful comparison would show in the matter of the charter of Dartmouth College that the draft transmitted by Wheelock contained the notable provision for religious freedom, but that the final form issued by the governor added the wise provision that the majority of the trustees should be laymen—two notably liberal features in an eighteenth-century charter which not only redound to the credit of the broad-minded Congregationalist and Anglican, but also illustrate their felicitous co-operation.

Wentworth's own breadth and insight are shown in his sympathetic understanding of both the English and the American positions in 1775, and in his abiding loyalty, even after his exile and loss of property, to "New Hampshire my native country". Particularly winning is his letter reciprocating John Adams's expression of affection. "I always loved John Adams." "My classmate", he added, writing at the time of Adams's election as President, "is the most perfect choice that could mark the good sense and sound judgment of the United States."

It is a pleasure to read a biography which so felicitously reproduces the best qualities of its subject and glosses nothing over. Worth doing and well done, it is a real contribution not only to the history of New Hampshire but to the understanding of colonial life and the two sides of the Revolution. The beautifully reproduced illustrations, especially the Copley pastel of Wentworth the year he granted the Dartmouth charter and contracted one more romantic Wentworth marriage, and the Copley painting of his bride, married at seventeen, and at twenty-four a widow for only two weeks until she became the governor's wife; the wide margins and excellent press-work, worthy of the press of Wentworth's *alma mater*; the author's saving sense of humor and occasional epigram, all combine to make an attractive book savoring of the gracious style of Wentworth House in Wolfeborough or Government House in Halifax.

HERBERT DARLING FOSTER.

Letters of Members of the Continental Congress. Edited by EDMUND C. BURNETT. Volume I., August 29, 1774, to July 4, 1776. (Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1921. Pp. lxvi, 572. Paper, \$5.00; cloth, \$5.50.)

WHEN the undertaking of which this is the first volume is complete, we shall have in most convenient form full facilities for a study of the work of the Continental Congress. As the editor modestly says of the collection, it makes on the whole "a quite notable contribution to the knowledge of the proceedings of Congress", though there is no such "transforming body of information as will tend to upset established conceptions of the Revolution", or Congress's part in it. Nevertheless, the editing, which ranks with the best that American scholarship has done, affords the student immense resources for reference and cross-reference never before available. Every canon of good editing has been scrupulously followed, and so admirable is the preface which describes the process that no better text could be furnished to a student of editorial method. One great object of the editor in assembling and choosing the letters to be published has been to supplement the meagre record of the journal, to bring together "into one place whatever information touching the proceedings of Congress may have come down from those who took part in them". Dr. Burnett explains that only those letters, or parts thereof, are included "which add something to the record of Congress beyond what is set down in the Journals". Mere expressions of opinion unless spoken on the floor of the House, or showing the member's stand on a measure, have been excluded. All notes of debates have been brought into this collection except such as John Adams's notes which had been published in the appendixes of the Ford edition of the *Journals of the Continental Congress*.

In addition, all fragmentary journals of proceedings, members' diaries, official letters, and private letters, which contribute facts of value have been included. In general, the editor has admitted only such letters as were written from the seat of Congress during a member's attendance there. A few exceptions are Galloway's reminiscent comments on the work of the first Congress, and the correspondence of Jefferson, McKean, and John Adams in their declining years relative to the Declaration of Independence.

From all these we may here glean new fragments of the story of what happened in that momentous assembly wherein there were no stenographers, no reporters, and wherein men were rarely proud enough of what they had said to have committed it to paper. A disappointing thing, as Dr. Burnett comments, is that "a large proportion of these letters come from the hands of a comparatively small number of members". Many members left behind no contribution to these pages.

Although there was an injunction of secrecy binding the members

not to reveal the proceedings of their conclave, there were many excuses for ignoring the order, of which an important one was the inclination of delegates to look upon themselves as ambassadors bound to reveal in confidence to the governors of their sovereign states all matters of consequence to them. Moreover, there was the natural human desire to confide to a wife or friend a dread secret which, of course, must go no further.

Regarding the collecting of the materials for this and the forthcoming volumes, the editor says that all historical and biographical publications wherein delegates' letters or papers might occur have been searched. Matter suited to these volumes was found more largely in print in the period before December, 1776, than thereafter. Beyond that date the editor was forced to rely much more on manuscript sources which he found in the archives of Washington, particularly the Library of Congress, and in the capitals of the original thirteen states, as well as in private and historical society collections of that section. There is a most useful survey in the preface of all the repositories from which these manuscripts were drawn. In fact it comes near being a complete summary of the repositories of archive material on the American Revolution. The new materials embraced in this first volume are letters of James Duane and Oliver Wolcott, and scattered letters from the Schuyler, Trumbull, and Bancroft papers.

The editor devotes several pages of his preface to a useful summary of the impressions made and the principal revelations of the letters in the present volume. Members of the early Congresses begin by writing of the great unanimity of the members, but soon they speak of it not as existing but as something to be attained if they are not to fail. The idea of independence growing at first slowly, then swiftly, and finally silencing all opposition is graphically shown here. The sectional motives that determined Washington's selection as commander-in-chief are clearly shown, and the insistence of each jealous province upon its proper proportion of high officers in the army. No right-minded reviewer can have any self-respect if he fails to offer some criticism, and the one blot on so perfect a scutcheon I find in Dr. Burnett's citation of Patrick Henry's assertion that he was no longer a Virginian but an American as proof that some were lifted "to a plane of idealism above sectional predilections and prejudices". When Henry said that he was only urging that Virginia be given more votes than the smaller states! The reviewer, though he has read several hundreds of the letters and checked up the editing at numerous points has found little to say in the review that is not said in the long and excellent preface, which in this case is not an obituary.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

War Powers of the Executive in the United States. By CLARENCE A. BERDAHL, Ph.D., Instructor in Political Science, University of Illinois. [University of Illinois, Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. IX., nos. 1 and 2.] (Urbana: the University. 1921. Pp. 296. \$2.25.)

THIS study is a straightforward dissertation on the subject indicated by the title. Four general phases of the topic are considered, powers relating to the beginning of war, military powers in war time, civil powers in war time, and powers relating to the termination of war. Each of the divisions is again subdivided into chapters wherein separate aspects of the general phase are discussed; for example, military powers in time of war are treated under Power to Raise and Organize the Armed Forces, Powers of Command, Powers of Military Jurisdiction, and Powers of Military Government. The reader is assisted by a somewhat detailed table of contents, a good index, and a full bibliography of the materials used by the author, although it is a little surprising that there is no reference to Maclay's biting *Journal*.

While there has been little if anything new brought out in this account, a large portion of the available information upon this highly important matter has here been brought together and summarized in convenient form. Constitutional provisions, statutory law, custom, and numerous comments both of contemporary statesmen and writers on law and government are marshalled in almost encyclopedic array. The encyclopedic flavor is somewhat enhanced, moreover, by a style which is not exactly easy or inspiring, although it must be confessed that the subject is not one which conduces to fine writing. The author has confined himself pretty closely to the strict presentation of the facts as he found them, and has not often ventured to intrude his own opinions in his summaries. However, when considering the question of the President and the Senate in relation to the making of treaties concluding wars, he does venture to state that

it would seem that much of the recent criticism of President Wilson by Senator Lodge and his followers is unjustified, especially in so far as it is based on the relative constitutional position and powers of the Senate and the Executive in regard to the making of treaties. However overbearing and tactless the President may have been in his relations to the Senate, clearly he has at no time in his negotiation of the Treaty of Versailles exceeded the traditional view of his constitutional powers nor encroached on those of the Senate.

A slight criticism might be made of the author's too great reliance upon general histories and traditional views in laying his background for some of his legal points; for example President Madison is again made to purchase his re-election in 1812 by yielding to war clamor (p. 85), and von Holst's views of Polk are clearly visible when the Mexican war and its inception are discussed (p. 71, 86). Again, when

outlining some of the forces determining the election of 1916, perhaps too much stress has been laid upon the fact that Wilson "kept us out of war". These criticisms, however, are of matters which are subsidiary to the main purpose of the book. But, when the Senate's constitutional privilege to "advise and consent" to treaties is under consideration (p. 244) and there is found the statement that "President Polk in 1846 referred to the practice as 'eminently wise'", it would have been more satisfactory had it been brought out that Polk actually did seek the "previous advice" of the Senate before he submitted to that body for ratification the treaty with England regarding the Oregon country, even though this was not a treaty closing a war.

Opening a Highway to the Pacific, 1838-1846. By JAMES CHRISTY BELL, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XCVI., no. 1.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1921. Pp. 209. \$2.25.)

THE author tells us in the preface:

The present monograph has grown out of a wish for more light on one early phase of this expansion [to the Pacific]. . . . The pioneers opened a road across the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Coast—the preface to territorial expansion—because they wished to realize the benefits from its geographical position in opening a new market for agricultural produce, and because they could not await but must have a hand in making their own destiny.

The above quotations give by far the clearest statement of purpose which the book affords, and the reader does well to keep this declared purpose clearly in mind as he reads.

The author departs widely from the method of exposition through narrative, traditional with writers of histories on the scale of this one. His is pronouncedly a monographic, "disquisitional" method. By this we do not mean that he fails to display a sufficient grasp on facts and incidents bearing on his theme. He has an abundance of these, but instead of causing them to stand up and tell their own story he, so to speak, makes them lie down while he explains what happened. This method always involves the temptation to subordinate facts to the discussion of their meaning, and it is to be feared the author has not always been able to resist that temptation. One of the outstanding merits of the book is the thoroughness of his search for the printed sources, and the author has used some unprinted material in addition.

As interpretation the book seems needlessly long and repetitious. The interpretation, in fact, is given practically in chapter IX., which is a review and restatement of what has gone before and is far clearer than the argument of the body of the book. Another partial restatement occurs in the appendix which follows chapter IX. And there is, in the main section of the book, much repetition of ideas and facts, and much "cutting and fitting" of facts to new turns in the discussion.

This last tendency is particularly disheartening to the reader. The author's statements have an inveterate habit of modifying themselves from chapter to chapter, and page to page, as the discussion proceeds on its easy, leisurely course.

On some points, however, he is very decided. He is convinced that the Lewis and Clark expedition was "almost negative as far as commercial exploitation and settlement were concerned" (p. 22), therein denying that the succession of American events following that expedition, the attempted exploitation of the upper Missouri trade from St. Louis, the Astor enterprise, and the restoration of Astoria, were related to it as effects to a cause, which is the usual view. He is clear that "the earliest effort made by any group of American citizens with material interests in the country west of the Rocky Mountains to terminate the joint occupation status of Oregon and determine upon a definite boundary, came from these St. Louis fur traders" [Rocky Mountain Fur Company]. In this he denies the facts brought out by Professor E. G. Bourne in regard to the Astor influence behind Floyd's efforts. He minimizes the significance of Floyd's pioneer agitation in Congress, charging that "the purpose of the move was probably to lend dignity to his opposition to John Q. Adams" (p. 64 n.), as if motive and result were in such a case interchangeable terms.

Students will be grateful to Mr. Bell for giving us a new interpretation of the beginnings of Pacific Coast history, and this gratitude would be all the greater if we could agree that the new interpretation is also a true interpretation in its general scope, as it assuredly is in some subordinate particulars. He has presented a perfectly sound view of the Rocky Mountain fur-trade; has shown with a clearness never before equalled how large a part the mountain trappers assumed in the emigration movement, and in chapter VI. (Agrarian Discontent) he has brought together a good many interesting historical facts not heretofore fully considered in determining the motives of the Oregon emigrants. But the present reviewer cannot convince himself, on the basis of that showing, that it was economically prudent for a few thousands to go to the Pacific at a time when many thousands were making shift to find suitable new homes along the older frontier; nor can he agree that the search for a new market probably constituted the dominant motive behind the Oregon movement. Of course the question is incapable of evidential solution. But it seems incongruous to assume that the Oregon emigrants had so reflected on the subject of world markets as to convince themselves of the inadequacy of existing markets for farm produce and the adequacy of the market on the Pacific.

The book is an attempt, not altogether successful as I think, to prove an hypothesis—that stated in the words quoted at the beginning of the review. But it is a well documented effort, it abounds in pene-

trating observations, and there is in it much that any student of western history needs to know. Some minor errors occur in the text, as is always the case; but these can be easily corrected.

JOSEPH SCHAFER,

Theodore Roosevelt and his Times: a Chronicle of the Progressive Movement. By HAROLD HOWLAND. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XLVII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1921. Pp. xi, 289.)

Woodrow Wilson and the World War. By CHARLES SEYMOUR. [Chronicles of America series, vol. XLVIII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1921. Pp. ix, 382.)

It is the clear right of the public man to have his biography written by a friendly hand, and to be represented for posterity in a pose which he would himself regard as characteristic. His enemies will, of their own accord, do enough to portray the unattractive and unsuccessful aspects of his career. The barrage of political criticism and the smoke-screen of his rivals may well blur not only the philosophy of a useful life but also the actual attainments. Here the general historian has limitations; for the degree to which he understands Thomas Jefferson may measure inversely his appreciation of Alexander Hamilton—and similarly as to Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. There is distinct advantage in the method of Professor Allen Johnson who has chosen, as his chroniclers of the two outstanding personalities of our own day, writers well fitted each to understand his man. From the standpoint of the *Chronicles of America* the policy does not make for uniformity, for the biographers are somewhat contradictory, by inference or by statement. But as yet it is more practicable and more important to understand Wilson and Roosevelt, severally, than to reach a final judgment as to their relative places in the sun.

Mr. Harold Howland has known Colonel Roosevelt as a journalistic associate on the *Outlook*, and has followed his leadership as man and citizen. His chronicle of the times of Roosevelt devotes two-thirds of its pages to the period before 1909, and reduces the political administration of President Taft to the position of one of the episodes of the Roosevelt Era. Without being unfair or unfriendly to Taft, he makes clear the way in which the years 1909-1913 cover the transition from Roosevelt republicanism to the democracy of Wilson. He has caught the spirit of his subject. The real "T. R." whose brief and rugged letters were made personal for their recipients by the interpolated sentences that he so loved to add with his pen as he signed the daily grist, fills the pages. There is no evidence of special historical research. Most of the facts here given may be found easily in Roosevelt's collected writings. But here and there Mr. Howland, as an eye-witness, clarifies or expands the story as already known. Notably, in connection

with the appeal of the governors and the decision of Roosevelt to place his hat in the ring in 1912 (pp. 206-212), he shows how the scene was set and the formal act rehearsed. "*I believe I shall be broken in the using*", said Roosevelt to his intimates as he made his choice.

Professor Seymour's companion volume is the effort of a trained professional historian who was brought into confidential and appreciative relations with his subject through his labors on the "House Inquiry", and his work as expert at Paris in 1918-1919. It is too exhaustively a chronicle of the World War to give a complete picture of Wilson as President; but it displays him as most of his admirers will like to see him. Half the book, roughly, is given over to the war in America; half to the fighting front and the peace negotiations. The estimate of Mr. Wilson's character is measured but friendly. "The summary disregard of Lansing, shown by Wilson at Paris, was less striking than the snubbing of Balfour by Lloyd George, or the cold brutality with which Clemenceau treated the other French delegates" (p. 13).

Frequently, in the things Professor Seymour does not say, and in the background of his careful statements, there can be perceived facts relating to the war that are not as yet fully revealed. The sentences devoted to General Pershing make one wish that the scheme of the *Chronicles* called for a study of the war, with Pershing as the central figure. The occasional references to the domestic history of the United States, 1913-1917, are made with less precision. One would like to know whether it is inference or evidence that warrants the statement that in 1916 "Hughes was ordered by his party managers not to offend foreign-born voters" (p. 91). We should fear for the personal safety of Professor Seymour in certain parts of Texas, for he has ventured to spell the name of that quaint statesman, the Hon. Jeff: McLemore, without the colon which McLemore trained the proof-readers of the *Congressional Record* never to omit (p. 59).

It is difficult to see how two volumes on these two themes could have been better adapted to what we understand to be the purpose of the *Chronicles*. They are enlightening, they are interesting, they are adequately provided with bibliographical aids, and they are beautifully made.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

Woodrow Wilson and His Work. By WILLIAM E. DODD, Professor of American History in the University of Chicago. Fourth and revised edition. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page, and Company. 1921. Pp. xviii, 454. \$2.50.)

It is Professor Dodd's object to "set somewhat the form of future history" regarding the career of ex-President Wilson (Introduction, p. x). It may be surmised that he is in a measure the victim of his own qualifications for a task undertaken prematurely. A friend and

correspondent of the former President, hailing from the same section, and exhibiting much the same political and religious traditions, he has hardly been in a mood even to seek the common denominator to his theme and the prejudices he would enlighten (Introduction, p. xiv.); and the outcome is a volume which must frequently prove less an interpretation than an exacerbation.

This is not to say that the work has not considerable merits. Professor Dodd possesses an unexcelled knowledge of the political, social, and personal forces that have contributed to shape recent American history, while his acquaintance with earlier American history furnishes him at will the apt analogy to more modern instances; his writing, always good, is at times moving, as in his closing pages; and his aptitude for the irony of bald, unvarnished statement is worthy a Tacitus. His point of view, too, has all the attractiveness—perhaps specious—of sentimental radicalism. He would fain do, or have done, some very upsetting things, but he would like to feel all the while that he had the soundest traditions of the country at his back. He finds the "farmer ideals" of American democracy (p. 270) still relevant to our political and industrial problems, and he spells labor with a *u* as well as with a capital *L*.

The general temper of the volume is, nevertheless, unhappy. Too great resentment is shown at what are admitted to be the ordinary hazards of political life in the American democracy (p. 398); certain abstractions, like "militarism" and "industrialism", are made into veritable bogeys; the opposition to Wilson is by no chance credited with a worthy purpose or a moral conviction; and though he commends his hero for refusing to indict the German people, Mr. Dodd himself does not hesitate to indict sooner or later the greater portion of his own countrymen. Moreover, in the effort to portray Mr. Wilson as the preacher "of the doctrines of primitive Christianity" (p. 293) and the martyr to certain great political ideals, Professor Dodd seems almost to miss the real fibre of Wilson's achievement, his vaulting ambition, his audacity as a politician, his dexterity as a parliamentary leader, and, above all, his splendid imperturbability, despite his undoubted sensitiveness to accumulating criticism and hostility. Conversely, he frequently exaggerates the difficulties which confronted Mr. Wilson, especially at the outset of his presidency (see pp. 120-123). The importance of Mr. Bryan's preliminary rôle of a voice in the wilderness is duly appreciated, but not the smallest comprehension is manifested of Mr. Roosevelt's great services in demonstrating the political feasibility of liberalism, in recasting the presidency, in forcing a relaxation of constitutional limitations, and in opening communications between the government and the universities.

Furthermore, the volume contains numerous assertions or implications of fact which the well-informed reader will feel impelled to chal-

lenge, at least in the absence of further evidence. Especially would one like to know with what warrant Professor Dodd would foist upon Mr. Wilson a virtually socialistic programme (pp. 121, 241-242); also the authority for the explanation offered (p. 244) of the Lansing-Ishii agreement, and for the statement (p. 180) that Mr. Wilson "had become convinced" by August, 1915, "that he would be unable to keep out of the great war". The assertion that Mr. Wilson entered the White House "against the utmost protest of nearly all the wealthy" (p. 110) seems to overlook the list of contributors to the Democratic campaign fund in 1912; and the statement that the railroads favored the Panama tolls exemption (p. 117) defies the probabilities of the case. There was no necessary inconsistency in the attitude of those who demanded a firm assertion of American rights against both Germany and Great Britain (pp. 187, 208, 216), nor was the "reactionary East" more zealous for its rights against the latter than was the cotton-raising South. The plea in extenuation of Mr. Wilson's capitulation on the Adamson Act (p. 181) is refuted by current events; and the conjecture that he "surely felt the unworthiness" of the shibboleth "he kept us out of war" (p. 191) overlooks certain of his own words at Shadow Lawn, as does also the assertion (p. 208) that he "knew that he could not adequately resent the wrongs upon American lives . . . lest he set loose . . . the chaos of party rivalries and racial conflicts". The explanation of why General Wood was kept at home (p. 255) seems at least incomplete; and the designation of Secretary Baker's statement, in January, 1918, that "no army of similar size in the history of the world, has ever been raised, equipped and trained so quickly" as "strictly historical" (p. 259) ignores the fact that the army in question was at that date neither equipped in full nor more than partially trained. Some lesser corrections are the following: Mr. Bryan's peace plan was not a scheme for "universal arbitration" (p. 133); the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act are distinct measures (p. 142); the Pope's peace proposal in August, 1917, was not "upon the basis then existing", but upon the *status quo ante* (p. 235); "Sir Herbert Asquith" is still plain Mr. Asquith (p. 305); the principle of "free ships make free goods" was not involved in the second of the Fourteen Points (p. 309); a constitutional amendment must be ratified by three-fourths, not two-thirds, of the states (p. 368). The reservations which Mr. Hughes and Mr. Root proposed to Article X, were not "minor" in Mr. Wilson's estimation (p. 396). There are also some notable omissions, as of any reference to Mr. McCombs's part in the Wilson campaign for the Democratic nomination, to the propagandist efforts of the Creel Committee in Italy preceding the President's visit to that country, to Colonel House's mission to Berlin early in 1915, to the Suffolk Pledge, to the Zimmermann note, to the possible reasons for the long delay between the breach in diplomatic relations with

Germany and the final declaration of war, and to the purely adventitious character of some, at least, of the support which the League of Nations received from the South.

In his Introduction (p. xiv) Professor Dodd asserts that "historians are partisans like the rest of mankind". Perhaps in result; yet surely not in intention. For otherwise who is to draw the line between truth and opinion? And that line is an important one in an era of H. G. Wellses.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

MINOR NOTICES

Gli Scienziati Italiani dall'Inizio del Medio Evo ai Nostri Giorni: Repertorio Biobibliografico. Diretto da Aldo Mieli. Volume I, part I. (Rome, Attilio Nardecchia, 1921, pp. viii, 235, 45 lire.) The present volume is the first installment of what may be described as a biographical dictionary of Italian scientists with especial attention to the bibliography of their writings and the literature concerning them. The period covered is from the beginning of the Middle Ages to our time, except that living scientists are not included. A supplementary volume is promised on scientists of classical antiquity who were born or lived in Italy. In the volume before us, of thirty-four scientists only one, Leonardo da Pisa, died before 1500, while five have passed away since 1900. It is hoped to continue the publication at the rate of a volume annually, which manifestly means that many years will pass before its completion. Professor Aldo Mieli, also editor of *Archivio di Storia della Scienza*, is assisted thus far by sixteen collaborators—all Italians—each of whom is responsible for the complete treatment of one or more of the scientists discussed. The book thus consists of thirty-four distinct discussions of as many men and their works, varying in length from two and one-half to twenty-three large double-columned pages. These discussions, as we are warned at the start, are arranged in no particular order, either alphabetical or chronological or of importance, reminding one of that ancient Italian scientist, Aelian of Praeneste in our third century, who, refusing to apologize for the utterly whimsical and haphazard order of his work *On the Nature of Animals*, remarked that it suited him, if it did not suit anyone else, and that he regarded a mixed-up order as more motley, variegated, and pleasing.

For each individual scientist there is a more regular method of treatment: first, a statement of the known facts of his life, then an estimate of the value of his scientific work, then a bibliography of writings by him and concerning him. Portraits and autograph letters are liberally introduced, and if the scientists are not always exactly handsome, their features are more regular than their handwriting in the case of the moderns, whose chirography evokes painful recollection of the sputtering steel pens in European libraries and hotels, and con-

trasts unfavorably with one specimen of a beautifully written letter of 1505. Apparently the art of penmanship has declined since the invention of printing.

In the competent bibliographies it is interesting to read the mere titles of books of science representative of the thought of several centuries, although the number of treatises turned out by these past scientists suggests a mass of material that may discourage the undertaking of a synthetic history of science. Some of the scientists here treated have been neglected by previous general histories of the sciences and medicine. On the other hand, some persons are now included who seem primarily philosophers and theologians rather than natural scientists. One also inclines to think that too many pages have been given to certain scientists as compared with others, but no doubt this was a difficult matter for the editor to regulate. On the whole, when completed and fully indexed, this should prove a very useful work of reference to students of the history of science.

LYNN THORNDIKE.

Arabian Medicine, being the Fitzpatrick Lectures delivered at the College of Physicians in November 1919 and November 1920. By Edward G. Browne, M.B., F.R.C.P., Sir Thomas Adams's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1921, pp. viii, 138, 12s.) The title of this little volume is in the nature of the case more or less misleading, for, as the author points out, there was no medicine worthy of the name in Arabia before the Prophet, and very few native Arabs rose to eminence in science under the Caliphate, nearly all the writers of distinction being Jews, Syrians, or Persians. The medical literature is Arab only in a linguistic sense or in the looser usage which makes "Arabian" synonymous with "Islamic". It shows little originality, being "an eclectic synthesis of more ancient systems, chiefly Greek, but in a lesser degree Indian and old Persian, with a tincture of other exotic systems less easily to be identified". Historically, "Arabian" medicine is significant in the transmission of Greek medicine to medieval Europe, thereby preserving to modern times some material otherwise lost—like the seven books of Galen's *Anatomy*—and in the careful observations added from the practice of the great physicians of Islam. Four of these, Raban, Rhazes, Haly Abbas, and Avicenna, Dr. Browne analyzes briefly, but without adding notably to what may be found in the standard histories of medicine. The freshest material, and that of most interest to the general reader, is drawn from the anecdotes describing current medical practice and from the unpublished letters of Rashid, physician and premier at the Mongol court ca. 1300. Persian sources are especially utilized, including the information (p. 93) acquired at Teheran, that the majority of physicians sitting on the Persian Council of Public Health in 1887

"knew no medicine but that of Avicenna"! The discussion of love's malady in Avicenna would have gained point by utilizing Professor Lowe's brilliant study of Chaucer's "Lover's Maladye of Hereos" (*Modern Philology*, XI, 491-546). The book is pleasantly written, and will interest others than professional students of the history of medicine.

C. H. H.

The First Crusade: the Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants. By August C. Krey, Associate Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. (Princeton, University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1921, pp. viii, 299, \$3.15.) This book is the extensive elaboration of a source-problem in medieval history, and as such should claim the attention of university teachers. It is apparently intended for use in a seminar made up of advanced students who lack the linguistic ability to use the sources in the original. Some scholars may doubt the wisdom of attempting to train students who labor under such a handicap, but if the seminar can be regarded as a phase of general education rather than a mere training school for would-be doctors of philosophy the usefulness of a book like this will be manifest. Indeed medievalists might well consider whether or not there are other topics which could be treated after the manner of this book.

The First Crusade is a subject well adapted to intensive study. It is a single topic, extensive but complete in itself. The sources are numerous and not only recount stirring events but also afford glimpses of eleventh-century conditions, reflect the spirit of the times, and give "the first fairly full description of European society since the fall of the Roman Empire in the West". For this study Professor Krey has translated fourteen letters from the crusaders, the complete texts of the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum* and the *Historia Francorum* of Raymond of Aguilers, and numerous extracts from all the other principal sources. The book is arranged topically and the appropriate extracts from each source follow one another under each heading, so that the student finds the work of selection already done and can concentrate his attention on the problems in criticism presented by the different passages. In order that he may be more competent to judge, there is an introduction to the texts explaining who each of the chroniclers was, what the general importance of the various sources is, and providing such necessary information of medieval terminology as will enable a novice to study the text with intelligence. In addition there are informative notes placed at the end of the volume and four maps (unmentioned in the table of contents) inserted in the text. The translator has sought to preserve the crudeness of expression, the vivid realism, and the differences in style and manner of the originals.

RICHARD A. NEWHALL.

Chetham Miscellanies. New series, volume IV. Edited by G. A. Stocks, James Tait, Ernest Broxap, H. W. Clemensha, and A. A. Mumford. [Remains Historical and Literary connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, new series, volume LXXX.] (Manchester, Chetham Society, 1921, pp. 236.) The *Dunkenhalgh Deeds* (ca. 1200-1600), edited by Messrs. Stocks and Tait, occupy about one-half of the volume. They comprise those documents in the possession of Mr. G. E. A. Petre of Dunkenhalgh Hall which relate to the possessions of the family of Rishton located in Rishton, Church, Clayton, and Dunkenhalgh in the county of Lancashire. They are mainly deeds, but there are a few miscellaneous documents in the collection, such as records of arbitrations and of judicial proceedings. The documents supply copious information about the history of the Rishton family, which has been utilized by the editors in their introduction. They also contain much of interest to the local topographer and genealogist, and to the student of medieval agrarian systems. In this connection the editors advance the significant conclusion: "The details of land grants strongly support the view that Lancashire was outside the area in which one of two or three open fields, in all of which tenants had an equal share, was annually left fallow" (p. 3). The documents are edited in the form of a calendar with occasional verbatim citations.

The remainder of the volume contains four papers. Mr. Broxap edits extracts from the accounts of the churchwardens of Manchester between 1664 and 1710. They are primarily of local interest, although the accounts of expenditures yield some slight evidence of social and economic conditions. Mr. Clemensha describes the contents of the court-book of the manor of Bramhall (1632-1657), but he edits therefrom only two brief extracts. The record illustrates both legal and manorial history. Dr. Mumford edits some Latin verses and speeches composed by scholars of the Manchester Grammar School in 1640 and between 1750 and 1800. Conceivably the historian of education might utilize this material, but its chief value seems to be sentimental. Dr. Tait contributes some records of the portmoot of Salford found among the muniments of the duchy of Lancaster. They come from the sixteenth century, and they supplement the records of the same portmoot for a later period edited by Mr. Mandley in earlier volumes published by the Chetham Society. Their contents are similar to those found in medieval manorial court-rolls. The editor has translated into English those rolls which were written in Latin.

W. E. LUNT.

Calendar of Deeds and Documents [in] the National Library of Wales. Volume I. *The Coleman Deeds*. Compiled by Francis Green. (Aberystwyth, the Library, 1921, pp. xi, 466.) Mr. Ballinger.

the librarian of the National Library, writes in his preface: "This Volume . . . contains a Calendar of the Deeds relating to Wales purchased from the representatives of the late Mr. James Coleman." Neither he nor the editor vouchsafes any further information about the history of the documents. With few exceptions the documents are legal in character, and they relate mainly to the transfer of real estate. Deeds, mortgages, leases, bonds, wills, and marriage settlements are the most common, although judgments, inquisitions, coroners' inquests, pleas, trust agreements, and extracts from court rolls appear in considerable numbers. The documents range in date from 1361 to 1884. Only seven, however, were written before 1500, and comparatively few were issued after 1850. Many come respectively from the sixteenth century and from the first half of the nineteenth, but a large majority of them dates from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The *Calendar* will be of use principally to students of local history and genealogy. It contains thousands of names of persons and places, which the editor has preserved in their original forms. The present value of this material is impaired by the lack of an index, but a remedy of this defect is promised when the whole of a projected series of similar volumes has been completed. An index will make the book a notable addition also to the meagre materials available for the difficult task of locating Welsh place-names. The documents contain a small amount of information about agricultural arrangements and about some other economic aspects of the period, but several terriers, rentals, and inventories, which presumably would be the most valuable of the materials in this field, are among the few documents not summarized in the *Calendar*.

The documents appear to have been well edited. The summaries generally are comparatively full, and the selection of the material for inclusion in the *Calendar* seems to have been made with excellent judgment.

W. E. LUNT.

Une Institution d'Enseignement Supérieur sous l'Ancien Régime: l'Université de Louvain (1425-1797). Par Léon Van der Essen, Professeur à l'Université de Louvain. (Brussels and Paris, Vromant and Company, 1921, pp. 156, 5 fr.) Dr. Van der Essen's little volume on the University of Louvain is divided into two sections, containing the history of the university from its foundation down to the sack of the city in August, 1914, by the Germans, and the organization of the faculties and the university colleges. In this latter part of the book, the author, who is a recognized authority in his field, has contributed a valuable addition to Rashdall's treatment of medieval student life. The description of the dress of the students, their games and pranks, the ineradicable practice of hazing the *bleus*, or freshmen, and the

gallant though unsuccessful attempt on the part of scholars like Bellarmine to limit the drinking bouts, are included in a picturesque chapter. "Les étudiants de Louvain buvaient ferme!", says the author, in referring to this prohibition movement of the early seventeenth century. The usual quarrels between gown and town—the Pettermans, as the students called the citizens of Louvain, and the hardy venture of the *noctivagi*—the night-prowlers—give a lighter touch to the tedious account of faculty conflicts or of difficulties between the city and the university—"puissance à puissance".

Greater interest centres around the first half of Dr. Van der Essen's volume, namely around the rise, growth, and decadence of the university during its five centuries of life. During the long period which has elapsed since its foundation (1425), the University of Louvain has been the victim of all the political struggles in continental Europe. Louvain's first age of grandeur came when Erasmus led the humanistic movement in the university. The age of Albert and Isabella saw the apogee of Louvain's glory. The famous visit of 1617, by the Archduke, is unique in university annals. Suppressed during the French Revolution (1797), the university was resurrected in 1835, and from that time down to the unspeakable tragedy of August, 1914, Louvain had waxed strong and had grown in numbers and in intellectual powers.

Dr. Van der Essen's volume is the first of a series entitled *Collectio Lovanium*. It is a marvel of cogent historical synthesis, and the best account of the university which has appeared in modern times.

P. GUILDAY.

A Political History of Modern Europe, from the Reformation to the Present Day. By Ferdinand Schevill, Ph.D., Professor of Modern History in the University of Chicago. (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1921, new ed., pp. xiv, 663, \$2.50.) This new edition of Professor Schevill's text-book is a reprint of all the chapters (except the last) which appeared in the original edition of 1907. As indicated at that time in this *Review* (XIII, 668), it is a very readable and readily assimilated outline of European history, suitable as a first text-book in good high-schools and even in elementary college courses. It is written in sprightly language and with imagination. It adheres closely to traditional political history, but is very successful in bringing out sharply the high points.

In the new edition the former final chapter has given way to a new one on the Character of European Civilization at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century. It emphasizes successfully the progress of science and the scientific method, the Industrial Revolution and its consequences, and the growth of colonization and imperialism. Two other new chapters explain European Diplomatic Relations and the Outbreak of the Great War, and the War and the Peace. It is here

that the author is at his best. Though necessarily very brief, these chapters show skilfully how European imperialism was the underlying cause, and Russian mobilization the immediate occasion, of the world-wide conflagration. They rightly emphasize the crime and blunder of invading Belgium, the importance of sea-power, the idealism with which America went into the war, the greatness of President Wilson's work at Paris, and the crippling effect on European reconstruction of America's failure to back up her leader by entering the League of Nations.

S. B. F.

Cosimo I., Duke of Florence. By Cecily Booth. (Cambridge, University Press, 1921, pp. xv, 325, 25s.) The aim of this attractive but outrageously expensive biography of the first Grand Duke of Tuscany is "to let Cosimo speak for himself and vindicate his character", and, at the same time, "to avoid any appearance of partizanship". The author persistently warns us that Cosimo de' Medici has been long considered a cruel and hypocritical tyrant, with all the vices but none of the virtues of the earlier Medici. She thinks that "the time has passed for writing in the style of 1848, when the word prince connoted vice, and that of republic, virtue", and would persuade us that the previous history of Florence and of Siena had proved that a limit should be set to a "liberty" which was seldom peaceful and never just. She believes that Cosimo strove, more than any of his forbears, to work for the good of Tuscany, and in the end deserved well of his country. In chapter X., we find an enthusiastic but convincing summary of his success in restoring peace and prosperity to the grand duchy.

Miss Booth sustains her thesis with scholarly care and moderation. She has used little unpublished material, except the correspondence of Maria Salviati, Cosimo's mother; but there is probably little new matter available. Her use of the published sources is thorough, and her bibliography helpful. It is remarkable, however, that she uses for the Sieneese campaign only Courteault's condensed biography of Monluc (*Un Cadet de Gascogne au Seizième Siècle*, 1909), and not his original, critical, two-volume study of 1908; and, stranger still, quotes the Monluc *Commentaires* from de Ruble's antiquated edition of 1861. She differs, by the way, from Courteault in her view of Cosimo's responsibility for the atrocity of the warfare waged by the besieging army before Siena, considering that Marignano probably "exceeded Cosimo's instructions in his cruelty to the unhappy peasants" (p. 143). Courteault insists, with good evidence, that Marignano was, on the contrary, urged to greater severity by Cosimo.

The book will be of considerable value; but the reviewer feels that the author has placed undue emphasis on the necessity of whitewashing Cosimo's character. Sismondi's rage against tyrants is largely forgot-

ten, and Armstrong, in the *Cambridge Modern History*, presents practically the same ideas as does Miss Booth. One finds it hard to understand why she has consistently used the spelling *concistory*, and why, in her otherwise excellent translation of letters, she is inconsistent in sometimes translating such un-English phrases as *Sua Signoria*, *Sua Maestà Cesarea*, etc., but in more often leaving them untranslated.

T. F. JONES.

Zur Vorgeschichte des Quäkertums. Von Theodor Sippell, mit einem Vorwort von D. Friedrich Loofs. (Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann, 1920, pp. viii, 56.) Theodor Sippell, pastor in Schweinsberg (Hessen), is known for many minute and subtly discriminating studies in the English sects of the seventeenth century bearing on the origins of Continental pietism and English Quakerism. In the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* for 1913 Sippell found for Labadie a formative or contributory influence in the more mystical circles of the English Independents. In Heft 12 of the *Studien zur Geschichte des Neueren Protestantismus*, 1920, Sippell presents an investigation of great importance: *Zur Vorgeschichte des Quäkertums*. Apart from the effort here made to trace a connection between Luther and George Fox in the succession Grindeltonians, Seekers, Quakers, the student of New England history will find some illumination for the dark topic of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson and the Antinomians. It is plain enough that Cotton and his admiring disciple had a different apprehension of religious experience from that which was characteristic of Calvinism, but the significance of the view of Cotton and Wheelwright has been obscured by the confused and inexpert utterances of Mrs. Hutchinson. Sippell provides meaning for the passage in Winthrop's *History* in regard to the prevention of undesired immigrants: "for it was very probable that they expected many of their opinion to come out of England from Mr. Brierly his church". This implied connection between the "Antinomians" and the Grindeltonians or followers of Roger Brerely helps to confirm inferences independently made by Sippell in his study of Brerely's sermons and the fifty Articles of Accusation against him, discovered by Sippell in the Bodleian Library. This study demonstrates that what differentiated Brerely and generated a new current in England was Brerely's adoption of Luther's version of religion unmodified by the Melancthonian compromises. It is in this Lutheran piety of Brerely, confused by inconsistent Calvinist positions in the minds of his followers, that we have the genesis of the Antinomian Independents, and later of the Westmoreland Seekers who were recruits of George Fox.

To this monograph Professor Friedrich Loofs provides an introduction, and an appendix contains the Articles of Accusation from the Bodleian manuscript, as well as a theological poem by Brerely. It is on the basis of such detailed studies that the spiritual history of Protestantism will ultimately be written.

De Theologische Faculteit te Leiden in de 17de Eeuw. Door Dr. A. Eekhof, Buitengewoon Hoogleraar te Leiden. (Utrecht, G. J. A. Ruys, 1921, pp. vii, 506.) The work of Dr. Eekhof contains 186 documents from the archives of the theological faculty of Leiden which concern the extra-mural relations of the faculty in the seventeenth century. To this collection is prefixed an historical sketch which serves to elucidate all these documents. Both the historical introduction and the documents are provided with minute and painstaking annotations, biographical and bibliographical, that make the publication of great value for any student conscientiously occupied with this period. Polyander, Walaecus, Rivetus, Thysius, Trigland, Spanheim, Heidanus, Cocceius, Hoornebeek, Wittichius, Hulsius—the world no longer cites these names or consults their erudite works or glimpses any personal characteristics that might reveal their private life; yet in their day they were men of mental power, solid learning, and voluminous production, and historical evolution used them as its vehicles.

The University of Leiden was founded in 1575 by William Prince of Orange, primarily as a Calvinist school. Netherlanders had resorted formerly to Louvain or Wittenberg, or after 1559 to Heidelberg and Geneva, but now Leiden could offer theological learning from men trained by Beza in Geneva. After the Synod of Dordrecht its eminent scholars drew students from England, Scotland, Italy, France, Poland, and Hungary. It was a characteristically Calvinist school, occupied, not as Lutheranism was, with the interest of soteriology, but with the mysteries of divine sovereignty as unfolded in the revealed scriptures; averse to all mystics or Anabaptist appeals to the inner word, resolving the Christ-in-us in the historical Christ; a school whose eminence was therefore greatest in the exegesis of Scripture, with more than usual assistance from a knowledge of Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic.

The documents show how commanding was the influence of these authoritative exponents of the Word of God. We see them as censors of literature. When Socinian works begin to circulate the magistrates ask advice of the theological faculty and receive so drastic a condemnation of the heresy that the books are ordered to be burned. But the documents show that the condemnation had to be several times repeated, and was ineffectual. It is interesting also to see how their judgment was sought in regard to controversies and church administration, and in particular for the decision of marriage questions. They enjoyed a dominance like that of the clergy in the early days of the colony of Massachusetts Bay.

Dr. Eekhof's editing of this material indicates accomplished scholarship, and his historical sketch is well ordered and interesting. One criticism is, however, in order. He does not exhibit distinctly, in relation to the development of Protestant thought, the significance of

the federal theology of Cocceius and the Cartesianism of Heidan and Wittich. These innovations in theological method were the means of transition from Protestant scholasticism to new forms, by which an historical construction of the Bible and the eighteenth-century debate over Reason and Revelation were at least introduced. Dr. Eekhof might well have given us these perspectives.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

The Social and Industrial History of Scotland, from the Union to the Present Time. By James Mackinnon, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, University of Edinburgh. (London and New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1921, pp. viii, 298, 16s.) As another reminder that Scotland, in consenting to parliamentary union with England, did not altogether relinquish her identity, comes this compact but comprehensive book. It fills a gap in the literature of Scottish history, for it is the first general treatment of that history's social and industrial phases which gives careful attention to the last half-century. With the eighteenth century, indeed, less than a fourth of the volume has to do, because, although the second half of that period saw wide industrial and social revolution, it was given to the times that followed to witness "the rise of a new Scotland in which the old would have no little difficulty in recognizing itself".

The author's outlook is catholic. He has, however, his predilections. Naturally, as one who finds recreation chiefly in gardening and golf, he appears keenly interested in technique; he enjoys picturing clearly any significant process, whether the mining of coal, the action of a screw-propeller, the making of linoleum or of books, or the cleansing of a city. He pays more attention to such matters than to details of organization and management. The story's human interest is enhanced by sketches of the careers of epoch-making or epoch-marking men, especially inventors, authors, artists, preachers. The author reveals his opinions without apology, be it in proclaiming Carlyle's *Machtpolitik* unwholesome, condemning a continuance of war-time animosity towards Germany, championing the church-union movement, voicing pride at the record of the Clyde shipyards, or admitting shame at the evils of overcrowding and drunkenness. He shows himself a true Scot, in stating that though the use of meat had become common among farm servants by the end of the last century it was "at the expense, however, of the decrease in the use of oatmeal, which is greatly to be deplored". Acknowledging the fundamental importance of industrial and commercial growth as conditioning factors in Scotland's recent development, he avoids, nevertheless, giving them disproportionate emphasis. Education, for example, receives as much attention as agriculture; literature and journalism as much as the mining, iron, and steel industries. With a reminder that "ecclesiastical contention and theo-

logical discussion have entered very deeply into Scottish social life". more space is allotted to religious life than to the rise and extension of railways. One might wish that the author had seen fit to do a little more generalizing than could be done in the three pages devoted to that purpose; the book as it stands is a collection of rather detached topical studies. Yet altogether, for a work so compact with detail, it is eminently human and readable. Presswork of the usual high Edinburgh standard makes the volume a delight to handle. Used with college classes this book should correct the common undergraduate notion that Scotland socially and industrially is merely an appanage of England.

REGINALD G. TROTTER.

Tropical Holland: an Essay on the Birth, Growth, and Development of Popular Government in an Oriental Possession. By H. A. van Coenen Torchiana. (Chicago, University Press, 1921, pp. xiv, 317, \$2.50.) The Netherlands East Indies might well appear upon the American map as "India Ignota". During the war when it became fashionable to talk about the great future before us in dealing with foreign countries, a vague attempt was made to interest our younger business men in the Dutch East Indies. For almost three years the Suez Canal was closed to neutral vessels, and trade between the Netherlands and the East Indian colonies used a new but circuitous route which followed the general line of Rotterdam, New York, San Francisco, Honolulu, Batavia. Our immigration officials encouraged the entente cordiale between these valuable colonies and ourselves by manhandling those Hollanders who happened to have been born in the tropics and by treating them as "colored people" although they were as white as the best Irishman who ever handled a shillelagh. Some of those peaceful travellers were administrators of territories which in mere size compared favorably with several of our states. Others were high in the councils of the almighty oil-companies. And the treatment, as recent developments in the oil-field have shown, was not entirely appreciated. As for the new trade-route it was discontinued the moment the Armistice whistles ceased to blow. The Panama Canal was deserted for the famous desert ditch between Suez and Port Said, and the existence of the populous islands of the distant Indies was forgotten.

Perhaps the disarmament discussions will make our people more familiar with the musical names of Java and Sumatra and the Moluccas and Banda and Banka and Borneo. The inevitable Japanese have found their way to the possessions of the Netherlands and the Dutch government is welcoming the general unpopularity of these foreign wanderers as a godsend. Dutch papers show the natives what would become of them were they to forsake allegiance to Holland. The Japanese is the bogey-man whose grinning menace keeps many a movement for

Indian self-government within bounds. Of these movements, of the aspirations of the native and the indolent inability of his leaders, Mr. Torchiana speaks with sound understanding. He wastes no sympathy upon the stock-conservative who "knows the natives, my dear Sir, knows them better than they know themselves", and who insists that all ideas of self-government are so much bolshevik nonsense. Neither does he praise the ubiquitous sentimentalist who loves whatever is brown, slightly-brown, or pure black because the people of that hue "have such beautiful souls". He shows that salvation lies on the very narrow and difficult path between the two extremes and he gives an adequate description of the historical background which is responsible for the anomalous condition of a colonial empire of fifty million people which is peacefully administered by a mere handful of civil administrators and fewer soldiers than are counted among the legionaries of New York's chief of police.

The book is hardly what the Swiss call a "hochwissenschaftliche Arbeit". It makes no such pretence. It is an excellent compilation and the sort of little book which saves you hours of irritating and puttering labor when you must know something connected with tropical Holland, when the *Britannica*, as usual, leaves your curiosity unsatisfied, and when you are in despair to discover just when Raffles was governor-general and when the abominable "Cultuur Stelsel" was abolished.

H. W. v. L.

William Bolts, a Dutch Adventurer under John Company. By N. L. Hallward, M.A. (Cambridge, University Press, 1920, pp. viii, 210, 15s.) This is the remarkable story of a Dutchman in the service of the English East India Company "who by private trade accumulated a fortune of £90,000 in six years, who, single-handed, defied for two years the civil and military authorities in Bengal, and who ruined an ex-Governor (Verelst) by litigation, and revenged himself on the Company for his forcible deportation, first by publishing a bitter attack on their administration in Bengal, and afterwards by establishing rival factors in the East Indies under the protection of the Imperial Austrian Government".

The book is not a narrative but a series of episodes occurring in Bengal following Clive's victory in 1757. The episodes reveal the Company's relations to its factors, their unscrupulous disregard of the Company's interests, their devotion to their own private trade, their intrigues with the agents of other countries, their arrogant threats against the native rulers in the name of the English government, and above all their exasperating oppression of the natives through the absurd claim to participation in the inland trade, consisting largely of salt, betel-nut, and tobacco, without payment of duties, while insisting that the natives were subject to such duties. The latter claim was the direct cause of the Patna massacre in 1763, as Governor Van Sittart, who honestly,

though undiplomatically, opposed the private trade interests of the members of the Council, shows more clearly in his published correspondence.

The circumstances of Bolt's deportation to England raised a number of questions concerning the legal status in India of factors who had been dismissed from the Company's service. Indeed the book illustrates exceptionally well the endless variety of questions and disputes which enabled the Company's officials, practically irresponsible, gradually to encroach on the sovereignty of the native rulers.

The book is by no means as valuable as a well-rounded account of this period in Indian history would be, but it contains interesting illustrations for such a history.

GEORGE F. ZOOK.

D'Ulm à Iéna: Correspondance inédite du Chevalier de Gentz avec Francis James Jackson, Ministre de la Grande-Bretagne à Berlin, 1804-1806. Par Commandant M.-H. Weil. (Paris, Payot et Cie., 1921, pp. 336, 18 fr.) Few men were possessed so completely as was Friedrich Gentz with the *cacoethes scribendi*. His active mind had an innate affinity with ink. The contemporary French Revolution and Napoleon, to both of which he was hostile, and the old order and Metternich to both of which he was attached, were large and engaging subjects for his active brain and ready pen. A bibliography of his writings and of material about him published fifteen years ago fills almost seventy pages of the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*. Much has appeared since. Evidently the end is not in sight, for Commandant Weil has discovered in the Record Office a packet of letters not hitherto used. M. Weil is a veteran forager in archives. For this discovery, he has all the enthusiasm imparted by a discovery. The letters are by Gentz. They are addressed to Jackson, the English ambassador in Berlin. They fall within the years 1803-1806. They have not been published, therefore they are important and should be published.

The abundance of material from and about Gentz enables one to ask sharply, do these letters add anything to our knowledge about Gentz and the period? The frank answer is that the contribution is small and relatively unimportant. Jackson scarcely took the trouble to answer the letters, and tried to silence the irrepressible Gentz. Gentz was unabashed. He was bound to keep open all avenues of information and persistent in stimulating every influence against Napoleon and against the Austrian ministers who paid Gentz four thousand florins a year. Furthermore, he was anxious to the point of distress, at the possibility of losing the stipend paid him by the British ministry. He could not be suppressed.

There is interest in the letters on the confusion and despair after Mack's surrender at Ulm and after the allies' defeat at Austerlitz. The letter in which Gentz depicts what he thinks Haugwitz, the Prus-

sian negotiator, would do when face to face with Napoleon, is so uncannily correct that you might surmise Gentz, writing in professed ignorance three weeks after the events, was making a great impression on Jackson on the basis of information received, perhaps, through Hoym, the governor of Silesia. Gentz's early estimate of Metternich as the coming man is made clearer by these letters.

Many of the letters are expansions of covering notes to accompany the stream of memoirs to be transmitted to London. These memoirs are not here published. The most important are probably in print, although the editor does not identify them. His contribution is chiefly in the identification, by long and unnecessary foot-notes, of persons mentioned in the letters. Ninety pages of appendices are used to the same purpose. Thus a book is made out of material that a discriminating editor could have brought within the compass of a contribution to an historical magazine.

G. S. FORD.

Twenty Years: Being a Study in the Development of the Party System between 1815 and 1835. By Cyril Alington, Head Master of Eton. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1921, pp. 207.) The exact scope of this essay is not easily defined. The anticipation of the reviewer that it would be a disquisition on the party system was no less happily disappointed than his fear that it might be a chronicle of political events of the conventional type. The leaders of the parties constitute the main consideration rather than the parties themselves. Sketches of their personalities, written with rapid strokes of a facile pen, and judgments of their statesmanship, given with mature and thoughtful deliberation, are strung upon a slender thread of political narrative, sufficient to provide the unity necessary for readers whose acquaintance with the period is slight, but not so long as to burden those who possess greater knowledge of this aspect of the subject.

The value of the contribution does not rest primarily upon the presentation of new facts. The author's modest disclaimer of original research, to be sure, must be taken with some qualification, for while he does not cite his authorities systematically, his text gives evidence of acquaintance with many contemporary memoirs, letters, and diaries; but it is true that he has neither discovered material hitherto unexplored nor attempted such a thorough investigation of all available evidence as might produce a great positive addition to our knowledge. The book, nevertheless, fills a place of importance in the historical literature dealing with the period. This place is so happily designated by the author, that nothing better can be done than to quote his words (p. 9):

... first impressions honestly recorded, have a value distinct from

those arrived at by long thought and study. A rapid survey may be inaccurate but it has a unity of its own, and laborious historians may fail to

recapture

The first fine careless rapture

with which they have once believed themselves to appreciate the true meaning of a period or the true character of a statesman.

This statement of his purpose is an accurate measure of his accomplishment with regard to the personalities of the statesmen of the period. Since Walpole characterized them from his Whig viewpoint so many studies of individual statesmen have been made, that it is high time for a new standard of measurement. This it is, which Mr. Alington gives us.

The treatment accorded the subject is such that it is difficult to imagine the type of reader, be he historical student or politician, serious-minded reformer or literary dilettante, who would not derive both pleasure and profit from the perusal of the volume. The narrative is enlivened by the author's keen sense of humor, finding outlet sometimes in his own epigrammatic expression and sometimes in the quotation of the pointed and pithy sayings of contemporaries. The author's selection of the latter material displays a penetrating judgment of historical values and his application of it a particularly happy appreciation of literary values. His kindliness, however, removes the sting which such a style generally carries with it. In all men he sees the bad but emphasizes the good. The strongest partizan must admit the tolerance of his judgments, while the historical student is likely, I think, to be impressed with the soundness of them.

W. E. LUNT.

Queen Victoria. By Lytton Strachey. (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1921, pp. iii, 434, 17s. 6d.) It is not easy to assign a place or a value to this book. To judge it as a source of information would be useless, because it is nearly devoid of substance. To test it with canons of historical method would be ungraciously to point out that it follows none. Yet there is about the book such an undeniable attitude, such an uncommon presentation, that one is tempted to call it simply "Mr. Strachey's Victoria"; and to trust that the initiated will grasp the implication.

Mr. Strachey has really succeeded in turning "Victoria" into something that resembles a light opera. Here is comedy in plenty, pathos, satire, irony; at the end, too, a tepid recessionary likely to satisfy the scruples of his audience—though perhaps not of Mr. Strachey himself—with a solemn note of altered measure at the passing of the great queen. For Mr. Strachey rather creates the impression of being, self-consciously, the most amused spectator of his own composition, only readjusting his features slightly at the funereal moment of fare-

well. His biography is not so much a gauge of character as a subtle display of incident and circumstance. He skims dexterously over a surface of anecdote and idiosyncrasy, gathering up the trivial and the familiar as he hurries along, never pausing once to fathom.

The general reader relishing entertainment at the expense of royalty assuredly will adopt Mr. Strachey's "Victoria" as his very own. He will be amused at the class of story that pictures Victoria stamping her foot in vexation at the Prince Consort; or pounding in vain at "Albert's" door demanding admittance because she is "Queen of England"; or at the description of Victoria in later life sentimentally plucking primroses to send to Disraeli in return for the thick and fulsome flattery of that "old comedian". In such a field an anecdotist finds abundant scope. Mr. Strachey has kept his field rather unduly restricted, however; perhaps because he confined the preparation of his volume to a minimum of reading effort. Grouping together his anecdotal material, with a few exceptions it is apparent that it comes in part from the journals, letters, and diary of the queen, with the *Life* of the Prince Consort and the inevitable Creevey, Stockmar, and Greville; in part from the lives of the Victorian prime ministers; in other words from only the current publications on the Victorian era to be found in any small private library. We are limited then to two sets of views of the queen: one, that is often too private and familiar; another, that is often merely ceremonious and official. Between the two extremes the real queen scarcely emerges.

When the character of the queen—as distinct from Victoria's incidental career—is made the subject of study, it were better done by a writer temperamentally more in sympathy than Mr. Strachey with the Victorian era, and less prone to look askance at its moral tempests. The trivial side of its great personages belies their force and depth. Mr. Strachey's biography is essentially an essay in Victorian trivialities—as refreshing to the student as it is captivating to the general reader—but, after all, only refreshing.

C. E. FRYER.

British Policy and Opinion during the Franco-Prussian War. By Dora Neill Raymond, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. C., no. 1.] (New York and London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1921, pp. 435, \$4.50.) Two brief chapters of this study are devoted to a survey of Britain's relations with France and Prussia, 1860-1870, and of the political situation in France during the first six months of 1870. The author then traces the negotiations and events of the momentous July days and discusses with a considerable amount of detail the attitude of the British government and of the public to the war and the various problems connected therewith. Among the topics treated with special care might be

mentioned Britain's efforts to safeguard Belgian neutrality by reinsurance treaties and to prevent the spreading of the conflict by creating a league of neutrals; the gradual veering of public sympathy in favor of France; the reception accorded to the Third Republic and the German Empire; the attitude toward France's efforts at enlisting aid or securing mediation by a friendly power; Russia's abrogation of the Black Sea clause in the Treaty of 1856 and the London Conference, 1871; Germany's peace terms and the Treaty of Frankfort.

The book is based chiefly on material from British newspapers and periodicals. Journals representing different social and political views have been examined with great care. Biographies, memoirs, and reminiscences of men and women active and prominent at this time have been used, but the list of these is not exhausted. It is hardly advisable to present even a brief survey of Britain's foreign relations during the sixties without consulting the lives of Palmerston, Russell, and Clarendon. Important omissions are noted also for the period covered by the main part of the study. The memoirs of Lord Cranbrook and Henry Reeve; Selborne, *Memorials*; Argyll, *Autobiography*; the lives of Goschen, Lord Houghton, J. A. Roebuck, and Shaftesbury, among others, contain bits of information that shed light on both policy and opinion. Use has been made of Hansard and the blue books, but one searches in vain for the most important French and German sources on the war and its origin.

Dr. Raymond reveals successfully British opinion during eventful months. Excerpts, skillfully chosen from a variety of sources, admirable summaries, and interesting episodes are knit together in a continuous story. As a study in policy the book has less value. It is too fragmentary on this topic. Nor is it clear that the author appreciates the tasks faced by Gladstone's great ministry.

Numerous foot-notes, a bibliography, and a good index make the book very serviceable. Several errors, some of which are doubtless due to careless proof-reading, have been noted. S. Low and L. C. Sanders are the authors of vol. XII. of *The Political History of England*, edited by W. Hunt and R. L. Poole. The numbers for foot-notes on page 233 are hopelessly confused, and we have Gray for Grey (page 31, note 3); Morley for Fitzmaurice (page 269, note 2). It has also been found impossible to trace many of the references to the *British Parliamentary Papers*. Such references should be made to year and volume of the blue books and the page of the "command paper".

PAUL KNAFLUND.

Histoire de la Troisième République. Par Lieutenant-Colonel Émile Simond, de l'Armée Territoriale. Tome I., *Présidence de M. Carnot, 1887-1894.* Tome II., *Présidence de M. Casimir-Périer; Présidence de M. Félix Faure, 1894-1896.* Tome III., *Présidence de M. Félix Faure, 1897-1899.* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle et Cie., 1913, 1921, pp.

470, 355, 444; 22.75 fr.) The first of these three volumes, covering the years 1887 to 1894, was published in 1913. At that time the intent of the author appears to have been that ultimately it would become the fifth in a six-volume series on the history of the Third Republic from 1870 to 1899. Then something, presumably the war, led to long delay and a change of plan. Instead of going back to 1870, the author decided to go on to 1919. Volumes II. and III., which have just appeared, carry the narrative on to 1899. Four more volumes, covering the period from 1899 to 1919, are announced for future publication.

About two-thirds of the space is devoted to a sort of general chronicle of public affairs, the remainder to a number of special chapters dealing with colonial, military, and naval matters. The chronicle portion consists of short sections, ranging from three or four lines to several pages. Each section gives a rather arid and colorless account of some event which attracted considerable attention at the moment of its occurrence. The arrangement is strictly chronological. Little in the way of explanation or interpretation is attempted. Each section stands so completely apart that if the reader is to get any general narrative he must construct it for himself. For the French who lived through the years covered by this chronicle it may serve to call to mind in concise and convenient form what they read in the newspapers at the time and as a useful statement of the bare facts about occurrences of a few years ago. But those who are not already rather well informed on the subject will get little assistance toward an understanding of the history of the Third Republic.

The special chapters include two upon the army from 1887 to 1899, and one upon the navy from 1871 to 1899. They consist almost exclusively of statistics and administrative details, useful perhaps for reference, but not illuminating. The chapters on colonial matters are distinctly the best feature of the entire history. Colonel Simond believes strongly in the value of the French colonial empire. In spite of the inclusion of more geographical details than readers can readily assimilate, his accounts of the hardships endured and courage displayed by French explorers in Africa are stirring narratives. The story of the French conflicts with the natives in West Africa, especially with Samory and his followers, is told almost equally well. His description of the difficulties overcome in the conquest of Madagascar is remarkably vivid.

Except on colonial affairs, Colonel Simond does not often disclose his own opinion about the matters he relates. In general he occupies a middle position and is somewhat disposed to be severe toward the parliamentary régime, owing to its frequent changes of ministry and its manner of handling the budget. Wherever a question of conflict between civil and military authorities arises his sympathies are with the army.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

Collected Papers, Historical, Literary, Travel, and Miscellaneous. By Sir Adolphus William Ward, Litt.D., Hon.L.L.D., Master of Peterhouse. In four volumes. Volumes I. and II., *Historical*. (Cambridge, University Press, 1921, pp. xi, 407, 397; 48s.) The Cambridge University Press has done a graceful and fitting thing in republishing the essays and reviews that have come from the pen of the learned Master of Peterhouse. It is a just tribute to one whose erudition has contributed so much to various phases of literary and political history.

These two volumes include the *Splitter* and *Spönc* from the political history workshop. There are thirty-seven of them in all. Ten are reprints of essays or lectures and the rest are reviews which have appeared chiefly in the *Saturday Review*, *Manchester Guardian*, and *English Historical Review*. In point of time the latter range from the fourth edition of Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* in 1873, which in an additional chapter took notice of the new German Empire, to Lord's *Second Partition of Poland*, published in 1916. They are as varied in interest as Finlay's *History of Greece*, Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte Roms*, the *Songs of the Thirty Years' War*, Gardiner's *Reign of Charles I.*, Gentz's *Letters*, Hertslet's *Map of Europe by Treaty*, and Hohenlohe's *Memoirs*. Most of them are related to the history of Germany, especially the minor states and the seventeenth century. They are (except the forty-two pages on Gardiner) essentially brief essays, which summarized for the readers of the *Spectator* or *Guardian* in an independent and discriminating way the contributions of scholars to whose works the intelligent reader might not have access. How much they gave or presupposed of a factual character is indicated by a twenty-three-page double-column index of proper names.

Of the essays, the most familiar is that which opens the volume edited by Kirkpatrick as *Lectures on the History of the Nineteenth Century* (1904). The historian of the development of the idea of a league of nations will find interesting suggestions as he compares this with the opening essay on the Peace of Europe written in 1873 and again with Professor Ward's little pamphlet in the *Helps for Students of History* published by the S.P.C.K. in 1920. There will not be many better examples available of the development, in an intelligent mind, during the last half-century, of a significant idea.

The most extensive essay is the hundred pages devoted to the decline of Prussia under Frederick William II. (1786-1797.) It is the only treatment of this reign, of any length, available in English. Written in 1891 it leans heavily on Philippson and Sybel but despite attacks on the former they are good supports. The essay—like others—is sturdily left without reference to any literature since its preparation. While it is wholly political in content it is unsympathetic and therefore essentially unpolitical in interpretation.

In the reviews of the historical literature of the Thirty Years' War and of the lesser German states, especially Hanover, Dr. Ward

is most at home. Even the specialist will be glad to have available what he wrote about books for the readers of enlightened popular periodicals, and his own interpretations of Elizabeth of Bohemia, the effects of the Thirty Years' War, and Leibnitz as a politician.

Le Maréchal Lyautey: le Soldat, l'Écrivain, le Politique. Par Amédée Britsch. [Les Cahiers de la Victoire.] (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1921, pp. 265, 6.75 fr.) This little biography may at first seem superficial and thus easily be underrated. The author admits that he has little acquaintance with the lands in which the marshal won his fame. The work is frankly eulogistic and depends largely upon personal impressions received through contact with the subject, supported by letters and other works of Marshal Lyautey and some magazine articles about him, yet it does accomplish the chief purpose of the author: "instruire le lecteur de l'oeuvre coloniale et faire rendre justice à ses ouvriers".

The reader can get more of value from the book than if its faults were less transparent. It vindicates the French army and the colonial wars. Marshal Lyautey is shown as a wise administrator as well as an able general. Quotations from his letters reveal him more as a soldier and statesman than as a writer. Probably the achievement for which he will be best known in history will be the preservation of Morocco to France during the World War. He sent nearly all his French soldiers back to help France, and when ordered to retire to the coast towns he stayed where he was with his handful of French and his African troops, kept up French prestige, and lost no ground. The result was that Morocco did not have to be reconquered. We read with interest of the cabinet crisis at Paris in which he, as minister of war, appears as a soldier and administrator but not as a politician. The book gives the impression that Marshal Lyautey will loom up still greater from the perspective of the future than from the standpoint of the present.

The book is well and sympathetically written. It contains considerable information in regard to French expansion in Morocco and the political atmosphere there. There are two maps, an autograph of the marshal, and one or two portraits. There is no index, but there is a bibliography of works published by, or relating to, Marshal Lyautey.

A. I. A.

The Economics of Communism, with special reference to Russia's Experiment. By Leo Pasvolksy. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1921, pp. xvi, 312, \$2.25.) Russia has been so abundantly described and explained since 1917—sufficiently to make almost any country misunderstood—that a new book upon it might expect a dubious welcome. But Mr. Pasvolski has entered a rather new territory in that

broad field; or rather, he has explored it in a different way. He has written a criticism of communism as an economic theory, based upon its application in Russia. He has performed his task in an unexciting but convincing manner, with abundant citation of facts to support each statement and conclusion. He does not argue, but records and analyzes. His style might be better—it is too abstract, and his points sometimes lack clear definition for that reason—but it takes him to his goal.

The book contains two parts. In the first the soviet economic system is described under chapters dealing respectively with nationalized production, co-operative distribution, and the agrarian scheme. In the second part the results actually attained in each of these fields are stated and discussed. All the data given are from official Bolshevist sources.

Mr. Pasvolski is unusually well qualified to deal with the theme which he has treated. He was born in Russia and knows the country and its language. Though he has not been there since the Revolution, he has had access to some of the best collections of Bolshevist newspapers, reports, and documents outside of the Soviet Republic. He has also been in touch with eye-witnesses of events and conditions in Russia. His sympathies are not Bolshevist; but his bias against communism is well controlled, and his book is thoroughly judicial in spirit as well as statement.

Russia has been much more thoroughly studied as an economic clinic by Europeans than by Americans. More than two years ago the Osteuropa-Institut in Breslau published a carefully edited volume upon *Russisches Wirtschaftsleben seit der Herrschaft der Bolschewiki*. It was high time that we had such a study in the United States.

VICTOR S. CLARK.

La Constitution Allemande du 11 Août 1919. Par René Brunet, Professeur de Droit Constitutionnel à la Faculté de Droit de Caen. Préface par Joseph Barthélemy, Professeur à la Faculté de Droit de Paris. (Paris, Payot et Cie., 1921, pp. xviii, 364, 18 fr.) The author of this book has distinct qualifications for his task. He is an exceptionally promising representative of the younger school of French constitutional lawyers; he writes with characteristic French lucidity; and he has had several years of experience as judicial counsellor to the French embassy at Berlin. Accordingly he has been able to produce the most exhaustive, dispassionate, and generally learned exposition of the German republican constitution which has come from any non-German writer; and it may be added that no German discussion of the subject with which the reviewer is familiar is equally satisfactory, at all events for non-German students.

Save incidentally, the constitutional history of Germany prior to 1918 is not touched; ten pages suffice to bring the author to the collapse of the imperial régime. It would have been better to devote a

fair amount of space to an account of tendencies toward ministerial responsibility and other salient phenomena before 1914, and especially to a description of movements for political reform in the period 1915-1918; the historically-minded reader would very properly like much more background for the establishment of the socialist republic than is supplied. Being a constitutional lawyer, however, and not a historian, Professor Brunet has preferred to enter almost immediately upon his task of analysis and exposition. Perhaps he has felt that German constitutional development, down to 1915 at all events, has already been adequately treated—as indeed it has been—in *Les Institutions Politiques de l'Allemagne Contemporaine* by Professor Joseph Barthélemy, who contributes a preface to the present volume. At any rate, after a twenty-page account of the framing and adoption of the new constitution, all that follows is concerned with the basis and character of the republican system: the position of the states; the principle of democracy and its various applications; the machinery of government; the rights and duties of citizens; and the extraordinary economic and social provisions which give the constitution its principal distinction.

On the whole, Professor Brunet thinks well of the constitution as a document, and not badly of the new governmental system, considering the peculiar conditions under which it arose and must operate. He, however, rarely praises or condemns; and when questions about the constitution's durability and probable lines of development arise he entirely refuses to be drawn into the rôle of a prophet. Even in purely constitutional matters he is exceedingly cautious, as, for example, when, after presenting the arguments on the question whether the present German system is federal or unitary, he dismisses the whole matter by saying that, since the place of the states in the union is fully defined in the constitution, the question of federalism is academic and not worth discussing. In this instance, and in some others, a more positive conclusion would be welcome.

FREDERIC A. OGG.

Historical Source Book. By Hutton Webster, Ph.D., Professor in the University of Nebraska. (Boston, New York, Chicago, D. C. Heath and Company, 1920, pp. iv, 211, \$1.60.) Mr. Webster states, in the preface to this volume, that his purpose is to exhibit to high-school students "the historical development in England and America, and later on the Continent, of orderly, constitutional, and democratic government. . . . Second, . . . to trace the growth of international law and international relations". For these purposes thirty-three documents are given, all but Magna Charta and the Confirmation of Charters of 1297 dating from the last three centuries.

With the use of about two-thirds of his material, Mr. Webster attains his first aim with distinct success. The connection between suc-

cessive documents is not often close, yet as a whole, they give an orderly exposition of the growth of democratic ideals. The strictly chronological arrangement leaves an interesting impression of close relationship between Western Europe and America.

The second objective is, in the nature of things, more difficult to reach and the limitations of space are more keenly felt. The documents selected are indeed of great significance in the history of international relations, but they seem too few, too occasional, to trace the many slow and often hesitant steps in the development of international law.

The editor's prefatory paragraphs are excellent in giving briefly the reason for being of each document and its later importance. The index, though not extensive, is consistent.

S. F.

Guía Histórica y Descriptiva del Archivo General de Simancas. [By Don Juan Montero, archivist in charge.] (Madrid, *Revista de Archivos*, Olózaga 1, 1920, pp. 245.) In 1916 the *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos* began to publish, in sections supplementary to its successive issues, a series of guides to the chief Spanish archives. That relating to the Archivo Histórico Nacional at Madrid was published first (pp. 128); the guide to the archive at Simancas, prepared by its accomplished chief, has now been completed; in the case of the Archive of the Indies at Seville a catalogue (list of *legajos*) is being printed as supplementary matter in the successive numbers of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas*. Señor Montero's volume for Simancas contains some 50 pages of history and general description of the archive, 160 pages of detailed description of the various sections, an appendix of official documents, and excellent illustrations (15 plates in all). The latter show well the picturesque and interesting character of the old castle in which, not greatly to the credit of Spanish administrative method, these wonderfully rich old archives are still permitted to remain—for, as one who has recently visited Simancas can testify, present conditions of life in that forlorn village are no better than those described by previous visitors, from Bergenroth to Biaudet. Señor Montero's description, proceeding section by section, and almost *legajo* by *legajo*, is scholarly and clear, and his book will henceforth be the indispensable manual of all investigators. Especially will it be needed on account of the consolidation and renumbering of the *legajos* in the section called "Estado". Yet it has no index, and, though in fulness of information it far surpasses the existing guide published by Díaz Sánchez in 1885, the latter's lists have so perspicuous an arrangement that his book will still have some utility, and not be wholly superseded. Of descriptions of the place by foreigners (who can speak more freely than Don Juan might choose to do), Biaudet's, in the *Annales* of the Finnish Academy, remains the best.

J. F. J.

The Builders of a Nation: a History of the Pilgrim Fathers. By Frank Grenville Beardsley, Ph.D., S.T.D. (Boston, Richard G. Badger, 1921, pp. 56, \$2.50.) A book such as this could hardly have found a publisher in any year but 1920 or 1921. Roland G. Usher's *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers* filled more than adequately the long-felt want for a sound and readable history of the Plymouth Colony. Only new material, or a fresh interpretation, could excuse another presentation of this threadbare subject. Dr. Beardsley gives us neither. His style is undistinguished; his viewpoint, precisely what one would expect from the pastor of the First Congregational Church of Aurora, Illinois. Foot-notes, bibliography, and indeed all critical apparatus are lacking. In his preface, to be sure, the author refers to a dozen standard authorities (not including Usher) by surname, and mentions recently discovered "documents and writings hitherto unknown" which he has used; but from these, whatever they may be, little juice has been extracted. The economic aspects of the colony are barely touched upon. Minor but interesting controversies, such as the actions of Captain Jones, the religion of Miles Standish, the exact force of the Compact, and the history of the *Mayflower*, are passed by. The Bay Colony and the expansion of New England are dragged in as a sort of epilogue, giving the altogether misleading impression that the Plymouth Pilgrims provided the foundation-stones of New England and of the United States. In short, it is an honest but feeble performance on a great though hackneyed theme.

One merit let us recognize; in his extensive quotations from Bradford and other contemporaries, the author has spelled out their contractions and modernized their spelling. Until this be done for the whole, or the greater part of Bradford's *History*, that matchless chronicle of colonization will remain inaccessible to the average reader. At present, beside an atrociously Bowdlerized version by an English editor, our only editions of Bradford reproduce so much of the original's phonetic spelling and manuscript abbreviations, as to repel the unscholarly public.

S. E. M.

Voyage of the Sonora in the Second Bucareli Expedition. By Don Francisco Antonio Mourelle. Translated by the Hon. Daines Barrington, with notes by Thomas C. Russell. (San Francisco, privately printed, 1920, pp. xii, 120.) This is a reprint *de luxe* of a rare and useful volume, together with maps, notes, and an index which have been added by the editor and printer, Mr. Russell. It is directed primarily to the wealthy bibliophile, in an edition of two hundred and thirty copies, but is nevertheless of value to scholars.

The body of the book is the diary of Mourelle, a pilot on the *Sonora* in the Spanish expedition of 1775 to the northwest coast of North America. A copy of the diary came into the possession of

Daines Barrington, who published a translation (London, 1781) in Barrington's *Miscellanies*. This is reproduced, line for line and page for page, together with Barrington's footnotes.

The voyage of the *Sonora* was one episode in perhaps the most important series of expeditions that the Spaniards ever sent to Alta California and the northwest coast. They succeeded in placing the formerly precarious Spanish establishments of Alta California on a permanent basis, thus averting an abandonment that might have operated against the eventual American acquisition of the province. The object of the *Sonora*, in company with the *Santiago*, its consort, was to explore the coasts north of the Spanish settlements and enquire into the supposed activities of rival powers.

Obviously, the official diary of a prominent figure like Mourelle is material of value. Still more worth while, though clearly not suited to Mr. Russell's special purpose, would have been an edition of the original Spanish, contemporary copies of which are to be found in Mexico City and Seville, besides the transcript existing in the Bancroft Library, where Mr. Russell did much of his work. Some criticism may be made of his evident failure to consult this copy in preparing his own notes. It is to be regretted, too, that Mr. Russell could not see his way clear to run off a cheaper edition which would in fact be more available to scholars than the present work is likely to be.

Nevertheless, there is much to commend in the book as it stands. The editor's notes, while not always abreast of the latest findings, were evidently prepared with care. Exceptional pains were taken in proof-reading and printing. For once, we have a book with accents where they belong. There is a good, topical index. Decidedly, the work is worth while, and a credit to its editor and publisher.

CHARLES E. CHAPMAN.

Anthology and Bibliography of Niagara Falls. By Charles Mason Dow, LL.D. In two volumes. (Albany, the State, 1921, pp. xvi, 689, 690-1423.) The late Charles M. Dow of Jamestown, N. Y., was very much interested in Niagara Falls and for sixteen years was a member of the Reservation Commission. His interest led him to compile this work, which is a bibliography and anthology of the falls, perhaps the most visited spot in America. As a whole the work is a very satisfactory compilation for the general reader and average public library, for it contains much rare and interesting material and it is conveniently arranged. It is divided into twelve chapters giving accounts of travellers, historical and reminiscent material, natural history and science, music, poetry and fiction, maps and pictures, industrial Niagara, preservation of the falls, and "the open road, guides, railroads, canals, and bridges". When selections

are not given at length, comment is made as to the character of the account.

The accounts are most interesting, from simple statements like Champlain's to affected accounts like James Dixon's (p. 241) and Lady Stuart Wortley's (p. 246), and studied descriptions by famous travellers and literary people, such as Dickens, Alfred Wallace, Sir Edwin Arnold, Howells, Margaret Fuller, Harriet Martineau, N. P. Willis, and Hawthorne. The daring of Blondin and the accounts of escapes are thrilling.

When one turns to the work not as a casual reader, but as a student and investigator, the work is not so satisfactory. It was done largely by compilers and their historical sense was frequently defective. There are many omissions. There is nothing on aboriginal Niagara. The early French period is quite weak: for instance, Champlain's works are referred to only in modern reprint editions; only three early editions of Hennepin (of about thirty) are given; Champlain's map of 1613, the earliest, is omitted, and 1632 is given as the first; Joliet's map of 1672 is not mentioned, and of the three maps of 1674 only one is cited; of Hennepin's fifteen early editions only two are mentioned; twenty-one maps of the period of discoveries are likewise omitted. The alphabetical list of authors only makes it difficult to find items in the text. For instance, LaSalle, the discoverer, is not mentioned, such subjects as "recession" and "bridges" cannot be located, and such inequalities appear as four references for the scholarly work of Dr. Frank H. Severance, and seventy-two for a newspaper correspondent.

Mr. Dow in his introduction explicitly disclaimed completeness in selections and editions. With this in mind and with the contribution which has been made to the resources of the average library and individual, perhaps the scholar will forgive the omissions.

AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER.

The Life of Artemas Ward, the First Commander-in-Chief of the American Revolution. By Charles Martyn. (New York, Artemas Ward, 1921, pp. xiii, 334.) Few things are more difficult than to see the events of the past as they appeared at the time. We know the leaders who proved their ability and we assume unconsciously that the same information was at hand when it would have been most useful. This truth must be constantly remembered when we read Charles Martyn's biography of Artemas Ward, for in the mind of both author and publisher the first commander-in-chief of the Revolution has not been given the place in history which he deserves and their purpose is to assure him that position. There has been a careful examination of Ward manuscripts and secondary material wherever found, resulting in much additional information on disputed points.

The biography opens with a description of Ward's youth and his training in the enforcement of law when justice of the peace. His services in the French War are outlined as furnishing the education in arms for the future Massachusetts general. An account of the beginnings of the Revolution in New England follows, in which the importance of the villages in maintaining the sentiment for independence, in spite of the reluctance of many of the larger towns, is emphasized. Ward, representing the country, united with Samuel Adams of Boston, and a revolutionary government was established.

About eighty pages of the biography are devoted to this introduction. Nearly three times as many describe Ward's active service against the British in Boston, 1775-1776, and these are the vital pages of the volume. In them the author seeks to present the able commander to whom the first successes of the Revolution were due and he believes it unfair to give the credit for this New England victory to subordinate generals. He considers that political policy rather than superior military ability dictated the appointment of Washington as commander-in-chief by the Continental Congress, for no earlier training or proved capacity justified it. Ward was hurt and it was doubly unfortunate that Washington should have obtained his first impressions of his predecessor from James Warren, the chief among Ward's detractors, and that the British victory at New York served to discredit the new leader. It is useless to follow these controversies, but the grievance continued for years, as has the discussion of the Boston campaign.

After serving eight months under the new commander, Ward retired for a time from army life because of illness. The circumstances of his resumption of command in the Eastern Department and the difficulties of his work under constant fear of attack by the British are explained, and the merits of his activity in Massachusetts during Shays's Rebellion are shown. The monograph closes with a careful description of Ward's work in Congress, on the whole as a supporter of Washington's policies, and a brief summary of his last years at home. The volume is a useful biography, well illustrated, with abundant foot-notes, and its contents are well indexed.

CHARLES H. LINCOLN.

The Greatest American, Alexander Hamilton. An Historical Analysis of his Life and Works, together with a Symposium of Opinions by Distinguished Americans. By Arthur Hendrick Vandenberg. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921, pp. xx, 353, \$2.50.) Mr. Vandenberg, holding with enthusiasm the belief that Hamilton was the greatest American, has conceived a laudable desire to promote appreciation of him among American readers. His method of doing this has been, first, to address inquiries to a multitude of conspicuous persons, asking their opinions as to who was the greatest American, and

to publish the results. Some of the answers have a certain value, but most are profitless. Then the author prints an amateurish survey of Hamilton's life and qualities, couched in the language of conventional eulogy. It is doubtful if the end he had in view would not have been better achieved by somehow promoting a more extensive reading of the best of the existing biographies.

Trailmakers of the Northwest. By Paul Leland Haworth. (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1921, pp. viii, 277, \$2.50.) Mr. Haworth's volume owes its origin to his personal enthusiasm and to his keen interest in the achievements of the men who explored the Canadian Northwest. In the preface the author says, "For many years I have been an eager reader of the literature of the subject, and repeatedly I have myself made expeditions to the dwindling regions that yet remain unexplored. The present book is the outcome of this reading and of these first-hand experiences." A large part of the volume is taken up with a narrative of the expeditions of leading explorers from Henry Hudson to Captain Roald Amundsen, one of whom sought, and the other achieved, the famous Northwest Passage. There are chapters, among others, devoted to Pierre Radisson, De la Vérendrye, Alexander Mackenzie, Alexander Henry, and Sir John Franklin. Another chapter deals with later travellers and explorers of the Canadian Northwest, and here Mr. Haworth describes his own expedition into an unexplored region lying between the Peace and Liard Rivers. Except when recounting his own experiences, the author relies for his material almost entirely upon the diaries, journals, and memoirs of the explorers themselves and he has quoted very freely from these narratives. An effort has been made, not only to tell the story of the exploration of the Northwest, but also to picture conditions in the great region of ice and snow. Some of the most interesting chapters of the book describe the habits of the beaver, methods of travel in the fur country, Indian life, and the "brotherhood of trappers and prospectors", and the author has drawn largely from his own wealth of experience for the descriptive material and anecdote which fill these pages. The volume may perhaps be criticised as lacking in unity but in passing judgment the author's limited purpose must be borne in mind. It is also true that it makes no definite contribution to our knowledge of the history of American discovery and exploration and will therefore appeal to the general reader rather than to the special student, who has long been familiar with the sources from which Mr. Haworth has drawn. The volume is absorbingly interesting, however, and leaves one with a vivid impression of the cold and hunger and privation endured by the trailmakers of the Northwest. There are a number of good illustrations together with a map and a bibliography of some of the more important original narratives of northwestern exploration. Undoubtedly the volume will have served

its most useful purpose if it awakens in the reader a desire to seek these original narratives for himself.

WAYNE E. STEVENS.

The Free Negro in Maryland, 1634-1860. By James M. Wright, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Georgetown College. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. XCVII, no. 3.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1921, pp. 362. \$4.00.) From the presence of so many thousands of free negroes in ante-bellum times in the small state of Maryland one might surmise that their group must have attained separate organization there and a considerable measure of distinctiveness. That this was not so, is explained in this monograph's conclusion, which is a philosophical analysis of the free negro's status as a part of the "nether crust of the social body" in which the whites exercised control. "He had become such as he was, not because he was strong but because he was weak, because what was outstanding in him either served well the white man's purposes or failed to give offence that led to its suppression" (p. 335). The free negroes were "passive denizens", and the larger the proportion of them in a community the more unobtrusive must they be in order to procure toleration. In Baltimore, accordingly, there appears to have been less salience of individuals than in Charleston or New Orleans; while in rural Maryland, as elsewhere in the South, the free negro element was a self-effacing appendage to a régime shaped for the employment of slaves.

In the body of the monograph new light is thrown upon the precariousness of the freedom of negroes who had been manumitted by masters whose estates were afterward found to be encumbered with debt, and also upon the indenturing of free negro children; and of course the Maryland promotion of the Liberian project is enlarged upon. But for the most part the successive chapters are heavily buttressed elaborations of humdrum themes. The style of these chapters seems needlessly dull; for even if there were no picturesque figures among the Maryland free negroes, surely in the thousands of documents which the author has cited there must have been many more vivid passages than the few which he has quoted. Yet the conclusion lifts the book out of the class of the commonplace, for its substance is new, sound, and vital.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

A History of Lewis County, West Virginia. By Edward Conrad Smith, A.M. (Weston, West Virginia, the Author, 1920, pp. 427.) In its history, West Virginia is a typical American state and Lewis is a typical West Virginia county. A history of this county should therefore be both of local interest and of value to the student of gen-

eral American history. Mr. Smith has successfully measured up to this opportunity, for it is just such a work that he has produced. He gives, of course, a good many details that are of interest to the people of this county only, but he also devotes considerable space to a discussion of those events and movements in which not only Lewis County but the country as a whole participated. He discusses pioneer life, describing the manners and customs of the people and detailing their thrilling experiences with the Indians; the inconveniences resulting from the lack of facilities for transportation and the changed conditions that came with the development of roads and railroads; the bitter strife that preceded and followed the secession of Virginia from the Union and the secession of West Virginia from Virginia; and finally the industrial revolution that came to Lewis County as the result of the construction of railroads and the exploitation of the mineral resources of that section. In treating these topics he has made a wise selection of materials and has presented the results of his studies in a clear and easy style.

The author does not indicate by foot-notes or otherwise the sources from which he gets his facts, except that he gives an occasional quotation from the documents. His failure to do so was probably due to the fear that cumbersome foot-notes would detract from the popularity of his book as a local history. If, however, he had made some concessions to the convenience of historical students he would have greatly increased its value as a work of scholarship without hazarding its popularity with his local *clientèle*.

O. P. CHITWOOD.

The Rise of Cotton Mills in the South. By Broadus Mitchell, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science, series XXXIX., no. 2.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1921, pp. viii, 281, \$2.50.) This is an informing book in readable English. The first chapter contains an excellent delineation of the spirit of the old South and shows the blighting effects of slavery and slave methods of growing cotton on manufacturing development. Later chapters tell of the beginnings of the cotton mills, and their early vicissitudes. There was in the South leadership of sufficient intelligence even though at that time untrained, to make use of natural resources of climate and labor and to inaugurate the present splendid development of the cotton industry.

Early leaders like Gregg and Hammett are freely quoted, newspaper files are drawn upon and much valuable information relative to the spirit and ideas of the times is given. Most of the quotations are from the Carolinas, and too little attention is paid to textile developments elsewhere. However, since the same motives and conditions prevailed generally over the South the picture drawn for the Carolinas is essentially correct for the entire section.

The chapters covering the relation of labor and capital to the mills are particularly well done. The quotations are almost too numerous and at times leave one in doubt as to the author's own interpretations of the views presented. Men like Tompkins are too much quoted. Tompkins was a prolific writer but not a safe guide as an engineer or a prophet. It is to be regretted that the views of engineers like Lockwood, Makepeace, Sheldon, and Greene are not put forth. The activities of the New England mill engineers are not sufficiently recognized but the part played by commission houses and machinery houses is lucidly outlined.

The book states that New England cotton manufacturers never sought to realize Southern advantages in a large way. The author must have overlooked such great mills as those owned by the Dwight Manufacturing Co. at Alabama City or by the Massachusetts Mills at Lindale, as well as many others equally important. On page 270, 10,000 spindles is given as an economical size for a mill. This is the practice for small yarn mills such as those near Gastonia, but the average for mills in South Carolina is much larger. Probably from 50,000 to 100,000 spindles would be considered the most economical unit by most Southern manufacturers.

On the whole, the book is excellent, not only for the historian but also for the cotton manufacturer.

A History of the Constitution of Minnesota, with the first verified Text. By William Anderson, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Science, in collaboration with Albert J. Lobb, Ph.B., LL.B., Comptroller of the University. [Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Social Science Series, no. 15.] (Minneapolis, the University, 1921, pp. vii, 323, \$1.75.)

Journal, Missouri Constitutional Convention of 1875, with an Historical Introduction by Isidor Loeb, Ph.D., LL.B., and a Biographical Account by Floyd C. Shoemaker, A.M. In two volumes. (Columbia, State Historical Society, 1920, pp. 509, 515-954.) Professor Anderson has prepared a clear and scholarly history of the constitution of Minnesota. Minnesota is the one state having experience with a bicameral constitutional convention. Democratic and Republican members elected to frame the constitution of 1857 met separately in two conventions, but finally united upon a single document for submission to the people. The full account of the relationships of these two bodies is of great interest and value. One criticism of this book is that it confines itself too closely to the textual history of the constitution, once that instrument was framed. The author does not altogether neglect other factors, and makes frequent reference to judicial decisions, but his chapter on amendments to the constitution would have been more interesting to the reviewer had it commented upon the experience of Minnesota with five-sixths verdicts in civil cases (p. 157), and with the

plan of expressly subjecting the enactment of special laws to judicial control (p. 170). In his comments upon "due process of law" the author does not seem to have in mind the broad judicial construction of that constitutional guarantee (p. 160).

One defect, perhaps to some extent necessary in a work upon the constitutional history of a single state, is that the author does not bring out sharply the more important tendencies of constitutional development in Minnesota and their relationship to developments throughout the country since 1857. What the author gives us is good, but more of comparative discussion would have been helpful.

Students of state constitutional history will be pleased with the publication of the *Journal* of the Missouri Constitutional Convention of 1875. This is one of the important conventions for which neither journals nor debates were previously available. As published, the *Journal* makes an attractive appearance. The biographical account preceding the text will naturally be of interest chiefly to residents of Missouri; but students of state constitutional history throughout the country will welcome the clear though brief introduction by Professor Loeb on Constitutions and Constitutional Conventions in Missouri.

Publications such as the two here under review will serve as material aids to the preparation of a comprehensive history of state constitutional development. Such a history, when written, must take full account not only of the forces which determine what constitutions shall contain, but also of those which determine how they shall operate and be construed.

WALTER F. DODD.

ERRATUM

In the review of Hogan's *Ireland in the European System* (XXVI. 768, third paragraph, line 8), "material accessible in French" should read, material accessible in *print*.

HISTORICAL NEWS

The printers' strike, which delayed publication of our July number until the beginning of October, had also the effect of delaying the issue of the October number till the middle of November, but it is hoped that the present number will be published within a few days after the first of January.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Before this number of the *Review* reaches its readers, the thirty-sixth annual meeting of the American Historical Association will have taken place at St. Louis, on December 28, 29, and 30. The presidential address by Mr. Jusserand, on the Rearing of Ambassadors, will be printed in the next number of the *Review*, which will also contain the usual article descriptive of the sessions and papers. The programme is an unusually attractive one. The nominating committee has nominated for president Professor Haskins, now first vice-president; for first vice-president, Professor Cheyney, now second vice-president; for second vice-president, Hon. Woodrow Wilson; and for nominating committee for the next year, Professors William E. Dodd, Henry E. Bourne, William E. Lingelbach, Nellie Neilson, and William L. Westermann.

PERSONAL

We note with great regret the death, on October 8, at the age of sixty-one, of Mr. Edward Porritt, for many years a valued contributor to this journal. An English journalist, with long experience of the gallery of the House of Commons, he devoted years of labor to the preparation of his classical work on *The Unreformed House of Commons* (London and New York, 1903), a book of the highest merit. He had already, in 1892, established himself in America, as correspondent of several of the great English newspapers, and lived in Hartford, occupying much of his time, however, with further studies of English political history and of that of Canada. He was held in high and deserved esteem by a wide circle of friends.

Early in November, 1921, Professor Oscar Montelius, president of the Swedish Academy of History and Antiquities, died in Stockholm at the age of 77. One of the foremost of archaeologists, he was especially noted as an authority in the field of Scandinavian antiquities. He also took an active part in advancing international co-operation in the world of science, and was for a long time a chief officer in the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

Dr. Samuel E. Morison, of Harvard University, has been appointed

to the chair of American history in the University of Oxford founded by Lord Rothermere.

Mr. Charles M. Knapp of Syracuse University has been promoted to an assistant professorship in history and government in that university.

Professor William E. Lingelbach, of the University of Pennsylvania, has leave of absence from February through the remainder of the year, and expects to spend that period mostly in London.

As a step toward securing fuller co-operation of Ohio colleges and universities in the promotion of graduate studies at the Ohio State University, Professor Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, has been appointed a member of the graduate council of that institution for the present year, and during the second half of the year will conduct a seminar in the economic history of the French Revolution.

In our July number we announced that Dr. P. V. B. Jones had been made an assistant professor in the University of Illinois, but we should have said that he had been promoted to an associate professorship. Dr. Rexford Newcomb, formerly assistant professor of architectural history in the same university, has been promoted to a full professorship. Professor Albert H. Lybyer has leave of absence during the present academic year, and is spending it in Cambridge.

Capt. Edward L. Beach, U. S. N. retired, till lately superintendent of the Mare Island Navy Yard, has been appointed lecturer in naval history in Stanford University for the present academic year.

Professor Waldemar C. Westergaard, of Pomona College, has leave of absence, beginning in February, for a year and a half, which he intends to spend in study in London and in northern Europe.

GENERAL

General reviews: P. Lauer, *Sciences Auxiliaires de l'Histoire: Paléographie, Diplomatique, Bibliographie, divers, 1912-1920* (Revue Historique, July); A. Brackmann, *Literatur zur Kirchlichen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXIV, 2).

The October number of the *Historical Outlook* contains an article by Henry W. Lawrence, jr., entitled the Jolly Puritan, and one by Professor R. W. Kelsey on German Views of War Responsibility. Articles in the November number are: American History in Westminster Abbey, by Mary Dudderidge, the Panama Canal and Recent World Politics, by G. V. Price, and the Lecture Method: an Indictment, by Miss Mary W. Williams. Those in the December number are: Italy and Albanian Independence, by R. J. Sontag, and History for History's Sake, by H. C. Hill.

The October number of *History* contains the two discourses read by the Right Hon. Herbert Fisher, minister of education, at the open-

ing of the Institute of Historical Research last July, and at the opening of the Anglo-American Conference of Professors of History; a body of remarks on the study of legal records, made at one of the sessions of the latter body, by Sir Frederick Pollock, Dr. W. S. Holdsworth, and Mr. W. C. Bolland; an interesting article entitled *Illustrations of Medieval Commercial Morality*, by Mr. A. S. Walker; and the first part of a lecture on London and its Records, by Miss E. Jeffries Davis.

Mr. H. G. Wells's *Outline of History*, which formed the subject of an article in the July issue of this journal, has been published by the Macmillan Company in a single volume at a greatly reduced price (pp. xxi, 1171; \$5.00). This third or "educational" edition, "revised and rearranged by the author", is substantially the same as the second edition in two volumes. The revision has consisted chiefly in the elimination of a great many of the foot-notes (over fifty per cent. in the first thirty chapters), especially foot-notes of a discursive or controversial character; in the reduction of certain chapters or sections to the status of paragraphs; and in occasional slight modifications of the text, such changes sometimes taking the place of suppressed foot-notes, sometimes being made, so it is to be assumed from the abridged introduction, upon the suggestions of correspondents.

On February 22, 1921, the École des Chartes of Paris celebrated its centenary. Probably no other single organization has had so widespread an influence upon the development of medieval historical studies in the nineteenth century. The centennial has been marked by the publication of a *Livre du Centenaire de l'École des Chartes*, in which M. Maurice Prou, the present director of the school, has written a full account of its history.

Students resorting to Great Britain for historical or other study should be notified that it is for their interest to make use of the facilities for securing information and guidance which are generously afforded by the American University Union, British Branch, at 50 Russell Square, London, and that they should resort early to that institution and make their plans and desires known to its director, Dr. George E. MacLean, formerly president of the University of Iowa. Historical students coming to London will also do well to seek relations with the Institute of Historical Research in Malet Street (see pp. 58-60, above).

H. Berr, the director of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, has published a discussion of the relation of that journal to historical writing under the title *L'Histoire Traditionnelle et la Synthèse Historique* (Paris, Alcan, 1921, pp. 146).

Two recent studies on political doctrines are Grondin's *Les Doctrines Politiques de Locke et les Origines de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme* (Bordeaux, 1920), and Smyrniadis's *Les Doctrines de Hobbes, Locke, et Kant sur le Droit d'Insurrection* (Paris, 1921, pp. 212).

The Social Interpretation of History: a Refutation of the Marxian Economic Interpretation of History, by Maurice William, is brought out in Long Island City, New York, by the Sotery Publishing Company.

The New International Year Book for 1920, edited by Frank Moore Colby, has appeared (Dodd).

We note a fresh volume of R. Montandon's *Bibliographie Générale des Travaux Paléontologiques et Archéologiques, Époques Préhistorique, Protohistorique, et Gallo-Romaine: France, II. Alsace, Artois, Champagne, Flandre, Ile-de-France, Lorraine, Normandie, Picardie* (Geneva, Georg, 1920, pp. iv, xxviii, 507).

A series of profitable essays by Mr. Edwyn Bevan, collected from the *Quarterly Review* and other periodicals, is published under the title *Hellenism and Christianity*, by Messrs. Allen and Unwin.

The *Catholic Historical Review* for October has articles by Richard A. Newhall, on the Affair of Anagni, by the Reverend J. Gorayeb, S.J., on St. Ephrem, and by Sister Mary Agnes McCann, on the general history of Religious Orders of Women of the United States.

Mr. J. T. Jenkins, superintendent of the Lancashire and Western Sea Fisheries, has published a *History of the Whale Fisheries* (London, Witherby, pp. 336), from the Basque fisheries of the tenth century down to the present time.

The *Magazine of History*, which suspended publication at the end of 1917, has resumed its career, but as a quarterly, beginning with July, 1921. Included in this number is a letter from Washington to General Nathanael Greene, May 20, 1785.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. H. Hansen, *The Technological Interpretation of History* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, November); Commander C. B. Mayo, *The Study of History for Naval Officers* (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, November); Wilbur Cross, *From Plutarch to Strachey* (Yale Review, October); G. Zillboorg, *A Century of Political Experience and Thought* (Political Science Quarterly, September).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: E. Stein, *Bericht über die Literatur zur Geschichte des Uebergangs vom Altertum zum Mittelalter, V. und VI. Jahrhundert, aus den Jahren 1804-1913* (Jahresberichte über Klassische Altertumswissenschaft, CLXXXIV. 3).

A notable addition to the Yale Oriental series is *An Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic*, edited, from recently discovered tablets belonging respectively to the University of Pennsylvania and to Yale University, by the late Dr. Morris Jastrow of the former institution and Dr. Albert T. Clay of Yale.

Rev. P. E. Creuveilhier, in a small book called *Les Principaux Résultats des Nouvelles Fouilles de Suse* (Paris, Geuthner, pp. 154), sets forth systematically, under the heads of history, religion, law, economics, and philology, the results shown in vols. X.-XV. of the *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*, representing the excavations at Susa directed by M. de Morgan, and the interpretative work of Father Scheil, down to the time of the war.

Messrs. Macmillan have nearly ready the first volume of Sir Arthur J. Evans's very important work, in three volumes, on *The Palace of Minos: a Comparative Account of the Successive Stages of Early Cretan Civilization as Illustrated by the Discoveries at Knossos*. The first volume, elaborately illustrated, will present a brief survey of the neolithic and early Minoan civilization, followed by an account of the palace in the middle Minoan Age.

Two recent studies in the history of ancient philosophy are by W. Kinkel, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie: Entwicklung des Philosophischen Gedankens von Thales bis auf unsere Zeit*, I. *Geist der Philosophie des Altertums* (Osterwieck, Zickfeldt, 1920, pp. xi, 243), and K. Joël, *Geschichte der Antiken Philosophie*, volume I. (Tübingen, Mohr, 1921, pp. xvi, 990).

Studies in the history of ancient religions are by Bickel, *Der Alt-römische Gottesbegriff; eine Studie zur Antiken Religionsgeschichte* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1921); Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1921); and Kern, *Orpheus, eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1920).

Studies in early law are A. Steinwenter, *Studien zu den Koptischen Rechtsurkunden aus Oberägypten* (Leipzig, Haessel, 1920, pp. 79); and B. Ehrenberg, *Die Rechtsidee im Frühen Griechentum: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Werdenden Polis* (Leipzig, Hirzel, 1921, pp. xii, 150).

The *Loeb Classical Library* (Putnams) has added to its historical authors *Apollodorus* in two volumes, translated and edited by Sir James G. Frazer, who departs from the ordinary method of this series by a more elaborate annotation and by the addition of 140 pages of appendixes, in which, *more suo*, he pours out his astonishing learning in discussion of such matters as the War of Earth and Heaven, the Origin of Fire, Clashing Rocks, the Vow of Idomeneus, and the story of Odysseus and Polyphemus, all illustrated by parallels from the most various regions of the earth; the two volumes thus become a storehouse of myth, legend, and folklore.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has issued in its series of translations of early documents *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, and *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, both edited by Dr. Montague R. James.

F. Münzer, a scholar already well known for his contributions to ancient history, has investigated in *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart, Metzler, 1920, pp. viii, 438) one phase of the politics of the Roman Republic.

J. Toutain continues his *Les Cultes Païens dans l'Empire Romain*, with volume III., *Les Cultes Indigènes Nationaux et Locaux: Afrique du Nord, Péninsule Ibérique et Gaule* (Paris, Leroux, 1920, pp. 470). The work is already well known for its scholarship.

Signor Gulielmo Ferrero's long-announced study of *The Ruins of Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity*, covering the period from the death of Alexander Severus to that of Constantine, is now published by Messrs. George Putnam's Sons.

A conscientious and useful study is A. Stein's *Römische Reichsbeamte der Provinz Thracia* (Sarajevo, Zemaljska Stamparija, 1920, pp. vi, 137).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Thilenius, *Primitive's Geld* (Archiv für Anthropologie, XVIII.); K. Sethe, *Die Aegyptologie: Zweck, Inhalt, und Bedeutung dieser Wissenschaft und Deutschlands Anteil an ihrer Entwicklung* (Der Alte Orient, XXIII. 1); E. F. Weidner, *Die Könige von Assyrien* (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft, XXVI.); W. W. Tarn, *Alexander's ἐποικυῖα and the World-Kingdom* (Journal of Hellenic Studies, XLI. 1); Tenney Frank, *Placentia and the Battle of Trebia* (Journal of Roman Studies, IX. 2); Sir J. G. Frazer, *Roman Life in the Time of Pliny the Younger* (Quarterly Review, October); L. Homo, *Les Privilèges Administratifs du Sénat Romain sous l'Empire et leur Disparition Graduelle au Cours du IIIe Siècle*, I. (Revue Historique, July); George Macdonald, *The Agricolan Occupation of North Britain* (Journal of Roman Studies, IX. 2).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

In the *Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres* of the Royal Academy of Belgium (Séance du 2 mai, 1921) Père Delehaye discusses persecutions of Christians in the army under Diocletian. In normal times the position of a Christian in the Roman army was not difficult, only officers above a certain rank being obliged to sacrifice. From Eusebius and Lactantius Delehaye argues that sacrifice was the test which in the Diocletian persecutions drove many officers from the army, very few of them being martyrs, and in opposition to Babut and Bréhier he argues that the test was not adoration of the emperor; that, in fact, the *adoratio* introduced by Diocletian and maintained by the Christian Constantine had lost its original Asiatic significance and was only a matter of royal etiquette.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Dom H. Quentin, *La Liste des*

Martyrs de Lyon de l'an 177 (Analecta Bollandiana, XXXIX, 1-2); P. de Labriolle, *Le "Mariage Spirituel" dans l'Antiquité Chrétienne* (Revue Historique, July).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

A. Dopsch has published the second volume of *Wirtschaftliche und Soziale Grundlage der Europäischen Kulturentwicklung aus der Zeit von Cäsar bis auf Karl den Grossen* (Vienna, Seidel, 1920, pp. xi, 542). It deals with the political structure, the reorganization of society, the Church, the genesis of feudalism, the development of towns, crafts, and commerce, and the monetary system and coinage. He emphasizes especially the permanence of the essential elements of antique culture.

Volume II. of G. Caro's *Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der Juden im Mittelalter und der Neuzeit* is entitled *Das Spätere Mittelalter* (Leipzig, Fock, 1920, pp. xii, 413). J. Meisl has published the first volume of a *Geschichte der Juden in Polen und Russland* (Berlin, Schwetschke, 1921, pp. xii, 342).

In the October number of the *English Historical Review*, H. Idris Bell completes (pp. 556-583) the list of original papal bulls and briefs, 427 in number, preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum.

W. Cohn is the author of *Das Zeitalter der Normannen in Sizilien* (Bonn, Schröder, 1920, pp. 213).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. D. Constant, *Saint Dominique et les Fraternités Laïques au XIII^e Siècle* (Revue des Études Historiques, January); P. Joachimsen, *Die Reformation des Kaisers Sigismund* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XLI, 1).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Oswald Spengler's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* has called out a flood of pamphlets. Noteworthy among them are C. Stange's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes von Oswald Spengler* (Guterloh, Vertelsmann, 1921, pp. 35); O. Neurath, *Anti-Spengler* (Munich, Callwey, 1921, pp. 96); K. Heim and R. H. Grützner, *Oswald Spengler und das Christentum: Zwei Kritische Aufsätze* (Munich, Beck, 1921, pp. 73); H. Piper, *Altern und Neugeburt im Völkerleben, Ein Beitrag zu Deutschlands Neugeburt* (Hamburg, Gentz, 1921, pp. xx, 144); K. Girgensohn, *Der Rationalismus des Abendlandes: ein Votum zum Fall Spengler* (Greifswald, Bamberg, 1921, pp. 24).

G. Renard and G. Weulersse have prepared *Le Travail dans l'Europe Moderne* (Paris, Alcan, 1920, pp. 524), a volume in the *Histoire Universelle du Travail* edited by Renard. It fills a gap and is well done, but attempts to cover too wide a range of time and space to be entirely satisfactory.

We have received a copy of *Europäische Geschichte im Zeitalter Karls V., Philipps II. und Elisabeths* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1921, pp. 125) by G. Mentz. It is one of the little handbooks in the *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt* series, being number 528. It is a popular political history of western Europe; economic and social factors are practically neglected and eastern Europe is mentioned only when events there influenced in a marked degree political events in the West.

Messrs. Ginn and Company have issued *A History of Europe; Our Own Times: the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, the Opening of the Twentieth Century and the World War*, by Professors James H. Robinson and Charles A. Beard.

The Ford Lectures of next spring will be given by Sir Richard Lodge, professor of history in the University of Edinburgh, on the diplomatic relations between Great Britain and Prussia in the eighteenth century.

Two books dealing with Germany's eastern frontier problems have recently appeared; Laubert's *Die Preussische Polenpolitik von 1772 bis 1914* (Berlin, Preussische Verlagsanstalt, 1921), and *Osteuropa und Wir: Das Problem Russlands* (Schlüchtern, Neuwerk-Verlag, 1921, pp. 99) by E. Sauer, E. Rosenstock, and H. Ehrenberg.

Général et Trappiste: le P. Marie-Joseph, Baron de Géraimb (Paris, Jéque, 1921, pp. 355), by A. M. P. Ingold, gives a biography of an Austrian officer active in the interest of the Neapolitan and Spanish Bourbons during the Napoleonic period, who became a Trappist monk in 1816 and eventually procurer-general of the order. Although a work primarily of edification, the book has useful information for the historian.

A volume entitled *British Diplomacy: Select Documents dealing with the Reconstruction of Europe* (London, Bell), prepared by Professor C. K. Webster, of the University of Liverpool, is designed partly to illustrate by comparison with the period of Castlereagh the problems and solutions arising out of analogous conditions in our own time.

Interesting volumes of reminiscences by the late Princess Metternich will be published, at intervals of some months, by Messrs. Eveleigh Nash and Grayson of London, entitled respectively, *The Days that are No More*, *My Years in Paris* (where her husband was Austrian ambassador during the Second Empire), and *Letters and Journals*.

The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs continues the publication of documents on *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870-1871*, the twelfth volume (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1921, pp. 480) covering the period from Aug. 7 to Oct. 15, 1866.

The Harvard University Press has published vol. II. of the English edition, edited by Professor A. C. Coolidge, of Dr. Alfred F. Pribram's *Secret Treaties of Austria-Hungary, 1879-1914*. This volume, which

contains the account of the negotiations leading to the treaties of the Triple Alliance, translated by J. G. d'Arcy Paul and Denys P. Myers, completes the English rendering of the first volume of the German edition, which was reviewed in this journal in April, 1920 (XXV. 493).

While in the service of the Russian embassy in London, B. von Siebert secured transcripts of documents which he has used in *Diplomatische Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Entente-politik der Vorkriegsjahre* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1921, pp. vi, 827). The organization of his material leaves something to be desired.

The recollections of Freiherr von Schoen, German ambassador in Paris in 1914 and former minister of foreign affairs, are being published in English by Allen and Unwin (London), under the title *My Experiences*.

The German Treaty (Oxford University Press, pp. 302), published under the auspices of the Institute of International Affairs, contains not only a text of the treaty with Germany negotiated by the allied and associated powers, but the contingent treaty of alliance between France and Great Britain, the official commentary on the League of Nations, various documents respecting the terms of armistice, and the like, together with three illustrative maps.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. König, *Erasmus und Luther* (*Historisches Jahrbuch*, XLI. 1); Lieut.-Col. R. J. Drake, *Secret Service Studies: France and England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (*Army Quarterly*, October); Baron S. A. Korff, *The Peasants in the French and Russian Revolutions* (*Journal of International Relations*, October); Graf F. Pourtalès, *Neues über die Entente-Diplomatie vor dem Weltkriege* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, September); A. Cartellieri, *Deutschland und Frankreich im Jahre 1912 nach einer Umfrage des Figaro in Deutschland* (*Historische Blätter*, I.); J. P. Niloyet, *La Nationalité d'après les Traités de Paix qui ont mis Fin à la Grand Guerre de 1914-1918* (*Revue de Droit International*, II. 3-4); A. Rafalovitch, *L'Absence de Solidarité Financière après la Guerre et la Conférence Internationale de Bruxelles* (*Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques*, March); P. Bignami, *La Conferenza Generale di Barcelona, I. Libertà del Transito; II. Vie Navigabili, Ferrovie, e Porti Internazionali* (*Nuova Antologia*, July 1, July 16); W. Lotz, *Die Brüsseler Internationale Finanzkonferenz von 1920*, II. (*Schmoller's Jahrbuch*, XLV.); W. Padel, *Die Türkischen Kapitulationen und Deutschland nach dem Vertrag von Sèvres* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, September).

THE GREAT WAR

Fresh revelations concerning the origins of the war are to be found in *Der Untergang der Donau-Monarchie* (Berlin, Berger, 1921), the memoirs of von Szilassy, Hungarian diplomat, who was in close contact with Berchtold until 1913.

Histories of the war continue to appear in great numbers. The first volume of E. Renauld's *Histoire Populaire de la Guerre d'après les Documents Officiels et Officieux et les Témoignages des plus hautes Personnalités Militaires ayant Commandé et Combattu au Front* (Châtillon-sur-Seine, Euvarard-Pichet, pp. vii, 312) deals with diplomatic preliminaries and the declaration of war. It also deals with the intervention of America and of Rumania, out of their chronological order. A satisfactory manual is *La Route de la Victoire: Histoire de la Grande Guerre, 1914-1918, avec tous les Traités de Paix et Conférences, jusqu'à l'Acceptation par l'Allemagne de l'Ultimatum des Alliés, 10 Mai 1921* (Paris, Gedalge, 1921, pp. 240) by A. Lomont. A brief account by an old soldier is General Niox's *La Grande Guerre, 1914-1918: Simple Récit* (Paris, Gigord, 1921, pp. 190). The third and final volume of *Der Krieg, 1914-1919* (Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut, 1920, pp. viii, 368) has appeared. It is a co-operative work by competent writers under the direction of Professor Dietrich Schäfer. At the end is a *Kriegslexikon*. The last volume of E. Guillot's *Précis de la Guerre de 1914* (Paris, Chapelot) is even more thoroughly filled with facts than the two preceding. L. Cornet has published the fifth volume of his *Histoire de la Guerre* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1921, pp. 436), in which he deals with the internal situation in each of the belligerent countries from April to November, 1915. The third and last volume of *Das Buch vom Grossen Krieg* (Stuttgart, Union, 1921) by von Ardenne and Helmolt has appeared. A. Veltzé's *Die Geschichte des Weltkrieges mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Früheren Oesterreich-Ungarns* (Vienna, Verlag für Vaterland, 1920) has reached the third volume.

The War Department has published *The War with Germany: a Statistical Summary*, by Col. Leonard Ayres, chief of the Statistical Branch of the General Staff (pp. 150), embracing statistical material of a wide variety, with many diagrams.

Freiherr von Freytag-Loringhoven is the author of *Generalfeldmarschall Graf von Schlieffen: sein Leben und die Verwertung seines Geistigen Erbes im Weltkriege* (Leipzig, Schraepler, 1921). W. Foerster has published the second part of his *Graf Schlieffen und der Weltkrieg* (Berlin, Mittler, 1921).

Les Origines et les Responsabilités de la Grande Guerre (Paris, Hachette) was prepared by E. Bourgeois and G. Pagès for a commission of the French senate on the facts of the war. It is very carefully done.

Volume VI. of General Palat's *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental* (Paris, Chapelot, 1920, pp. 496) gives a detailed study of the operations between the 5th and the 13th of September, 1914. Commandant H. Carré writes *La Véritable Histoire des Taxis de la Marne, 6, 7, et 8 Septembre 1914* (Paris, Chapelot, pp. 110). A German study is *Deutsche Heerführung im Marnfeldzug 1914*, by Baumgarten-Crusius.

Biographies of the more important French generals are appearing steadily. *Le Maréchal Galliéni* (Paris, Fasquelle, 1921), by P. B. Gheusi, is based largely upon unpublished documents and is written by one who was close to the general. It attempts to establish with exactitude the rôle of Galliéni in September, 1914, in the first hours of the battle of the Marne. Gabriel Hanotaux and Lieutenant-Colonel Fabry have published a biography of *Joffre* (Paris, Crès, pp. 122). Commandant Grasset has written *Franchet d'Espèrey* (Crès, pp. 140), and H. Bordeaux adds *Fayolle* (*ibid.*).

Les Transports Automobiles sur le Front Français (Paris, Plon, 1920, pp. iv, 346), by C. Doumenc, traces the development from August, 1914, when there were only 6000 vehicles, to November, 1918, when there were 92,000. The author was assistant chief of this branch of the service from 1914 to 1917, and chief 1917-1919.

A detailed story of the bombardment of Paris by airships and long-range guns is told by M. Thiéry in *Paris Bombardé* (Paris, Bocard).

The Royal Colonial Institute has planned a series of five volumes on *The Empire at War*, of which the first volume was published by the Oxford University Press early in November. The general editor is Sir Charles Lucas, who has written the first volume, which traces the growth of imperial co-operation in war time previously to the late war. The four remaining volumes, written by many collaborators, will record the effort made in the war by every unit of the empire beyond seas, and the effects of the war upon each such portion of the empire.

Forty-five narratives, by participants of all sorts—commanders, navigating officers, gunnery officers, medical officers, sailors, survivors of sunk ships—are grouped in an intelligent order in *The Fighting at Jutland*, edited by two naval officers, H. W. Fawcett and G. W. W. Hooper (Macmillan), which presents in a most interesting manner the human side of a great naval combat, without pretending to deal with the larger matters of strategy or tactics.

Captain A. F. B. Carpenter, R. N., who, under Vice-Admiral Sir Roger Keyes, had the leading part in the English attack on Zeebrugge, furnishes a vivid and authoritative account of that gallant feat of arms in *The Blocking of Zeebrugge* (London, Herbert Jenkins).

A dramatic episode of the last days of the war is told, with detail, in a defensive spirit, in *Scapa Flow: der Grab der Deutschen Flotte* (Leipzig), by Admiral von Reuter, who was in command of the ships and assumes the whole responsibility for their sinking.

Among the numerous publications by people in diplomatic posts is H. de Villeneuve-Trans's *A l'Ambassade de Washington: les Heures Décisives de l'Intervention Américaine* (Paris, Bossard, 1921, pp. 287). The author was an attaché of the French embassy in Washington from 1917 to 1919, and studies the relation of President Wilson with the

Senate. It is sharply critical of the President and attempts to explain his loss of control over the situation.

A volume complementary to that of von Lettow-Vorbeck on the war in German East Africa, written from the civilian side, but with less liberality of mind than that of the military commander, is *Deutsch Ost-Afrika* (Leipzig, Quelle und Mayer, pp. 400), by Dr. Heinrich Schnee, who was governor of the colony during the war. A valuable book surveying the whole episode from the British point of view is *The East African Force* (London, Witherby) by Brig.-Gen. C. P. Fendall, who throughout the whole period was attached to the administrative staff of that force.

Recent discussions of the negotiations for peace and the problems growing out of them include Mermeix's *Les Négociations Secrètes et les Quatre Armistices* (Paris Ollendorff, 1921, pp. 355), Meurer's *Die Grundlagen des Versailler Friedens und des Völkerbundes* (Würzburg, Kabitzzsch und Mönnich, 1921), and *Le Traité de Versailles devant le Droit*, I. *La Commission Interalliée des Réparations et les Dommages de Guerre* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. xii, 124) by M. Orgia and A.-G. Martini. *Le Droit des Gens et les Rapports des Grandes Puissances avec les Autres États, avant le Pacte de la Société des Nations* (Paris, Plon, 1921, pp. iv, 544) is by C. Dupuis, professor in the École des Sciences Politiques. The first volume of an *Histoire des Violations du Traité de Paix* (Paris, Crès, 1921, pp. 384) by Dr. Lucien-Graux covers the period from June 28, 1919, to Sept. 24, 1920. J. Bardoux has written *De Paris à Spa: la Bataille Diplomatique pour la Paix Française, Février 1919-Octobre 1920* (Paris, Alcan, 1921, pp. viii, 396).

M. Travers has published a second volume of his important work *Le Droit Pénal International et sa Mise en Oeuvre en Temps de Paix et en Temps de Guerre* (Paris, Sirey, 1921). He discusses the legal questions arising during the war and those connected with the Sèvres treaty, particularly extraterritoriality. A. Mérignhac, professor of international law in the University of Toulouse, and Dr. E. Lemonon have published a two-volume study of *Le Droit des Gens et la Guerre de 1914-1918* (Paris, Sirey, 1921, pp. ii, 661, 680).

Messrs. Bale, Sons, and Danielsson have published, under the title *Diplomacy and the War*, an English translation of the recollections of Count Julius Andrassy, formerly Hungarian minister of foreign affairs.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

A series of five volumes which teachers of English history, particularly in high schools, should welcome and use, is that of *Readings in English Social History from Contemporary Literature*, selected from a wide range of sources (which are sufficiently described) by Mr. R. B. Morgan, inspector of schools in the Croydon district, and published

by the Cambridge University Press. The work of selection is well done, the volumes are small and inexpensive, and the three thus far issued (to 1603) are very interesting, illustrating manifold aspects of the social life of England.

Allyn and Bacon have brought out a revised and enlarged edition of Professor Charles M. Andrews's *History of England*.

The Cambridge University Press will soon publish vols. V., VI., and VII. of their new edition of the *Collected Historical Works of Sir Francis Palgrave*. The fifth volume will contain *The History of the Anglo-Saxons*, while the sixth and seventh will be devoted to *The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth*.

Two volumes of great value in the same special division of English economic history are Mr. E. Lipson's *History of the Woollen and Worsted Industries* (London, A. and C. Black), and Mr. Herbert Heaton's *The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries*, which is volume X. of the *Oxford Historical and Literary Studies* (Clarendon Press).

In *The Year Books* (Cambridge University Press) Mr. W. C. Bolland prints three lectures giving a general account of the manuscripts and editions of these books, and of their origin and purpose, and a general introduction to their study.

The Dugdale Society has begun the publication of *Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon and other Records, 1553-1620*, by the issue of volume I., running from 1553 to 1566, and supplied with introduction and notes by Mr. Edgar I. Flipp (Oxford, printed for the Dugdale Society by Frederick Hall).

Mr. Frederick Chamberlin, in *The Private Character of Queen Elizabeth* (London, John Lane, pp. xxi, 334), enters elaborately, and with the aid of first-rate medical authorities, into the physical history of Queen Elizabeth, and on physical grounds, with due consideration of other evidences, acquits her of the scandalous imputations which have been frequent.

Students not only of Shakespeare but of early Virginian history will be interested in *The Life of Henry, Third Earl of Southampton, Shakespeare's Patron*, by Mrs. Charlotte C. Stopes, which is soon to be published by the Cambridge University Press.

Comtesse de Longworth-Chambrun has published a brilliant study of *Giovanni Florio* (Paris, Payot, 1921), the Italian lexicographer and translator, *temp. Eliz.*

An entertaining and extraordinary story, of events and developments that lie at the basis of much of the real-estate holding of present-day London, is told by Mr. Charles T. Gatty in *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury* (London, Cassell, two volumes).

Marlborough and the Rise of the British Army, by C. T. Atkinson, of Exeter College, Oxford, has just been published by Messrs. Putnam.

The Influence of George III. on the Development of the Constitution, by A. Mervyn Davies (Oxford University Press), is the Stanhope Historical Prize Essay for 1921.

In Whig Society, 1775-1818, by Mabell Countess of Airlie (London, Hodder and Stoughton), is compiled from hitherto unpublished correspondence of Lord Melbourne's mother, the first Viscountess Melbourne, and of his sister Lady Cowper, afterward the wife of Lord Palmerston—two exceptionally brilliant women. Parts of the book relate to Byron.

The Life of the First Marquess of Ripon, by Lucien Wolf, based on family and official documents, has lately been published by the house of Murray. Lord Ripon's connection with the Treaty of Washington will be remembered. The same firm has also lately published a volume on Sir Henry Elliot, ambassador at Naples during the eventful years 1860-1861.

Messrs. Cassell of London have issued the authorized life of James Keir Hardie, by his associate William Stewart.

From Private to Field-Marshal (London, Constable), by Field-Marshal Sir William Robertson, besides being the record of an unexampled career in the British army, casts light of considerable importance on the relations between the author, as chief of staff, and the prime minister, and on the genesis of the united command of the Allied armies.

An important contribution to the medieval history of London is *The Records of the Augustinian Priory of St. Bartholomew, West Smithfield, and of the Church and Parish of St. Bartholomew the Great in the City of London* (Humphrey Milford), from original documents, with illustrations, plans, and genealogical tables, by E. A. Webb, in two volumes.

Rev. A. H. Johnson now completes his *History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London* by the publication of volumes III., IV., and V. (Oxford University Press).

In the *Scottish Historical Review* for October the chief article, and one of much value, having also an aspect toward the history of emigration to America, is one by Miss Margaret I. Adam, on the Eighteenth-Century Highland Landlords and the Poverty Problem; there is also an interesting article on the Western Highlands in the Eighteenth Century by Canon Roderick C. MacLeod.

Messrs. MacLehose and Jackson of Glasgow have lately brought out the first volume of an important *History of Glasgow from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, by Sir John Lindsay, town clerk, and the late Dr. Robert Renwick, town clerk depute.

Messrs. Longmans published in October *A Short History of the Irish People*, by Miss Mary Hayden, professor of Irish history in the National University of Ireland, written in collaboration with C. A. Moonan.

Dr. R. A. S. Macalister, professor of Celtic archaeology in University College, Dublin, has a new work in the press entitled *Ireland in Pre-Celtic Times*, to be published in Dublin by Messrs. Maunsel and Roberts, and to be followed by a companion volume on *Ireland in Celtic Times*. The same firm announces also a *History of Medieval Ireland, 1119-1500 A. D.*, by Edmund Curtis, professor of history in Trinity College, Dublin.

Rev. Charles Plummer, whose edition of *Latin Lives of Irish Saints* was issued in two volumes by the Oxford University Press in 1910, has two companion volumes in preparation with the same publishers, containing an edition of some of the Irish lives of the same saints, hitherto unpublished, but now edited with his well-known learning and care. *The Latin and Irish Lives of Ciaran* (pp. 190), edited in English translation with full annotation by Professor R. A. Stewart Macalister for the S. P. C. K. series of *Translations of Christian Literature*, presents three Latin lives and one Irish life of the saint who founded the monastery and schools of Clonmacnois.

Alumni Dublinenses, a register of the students, graduates, professors, fellows, and provosts of Trinity College, Dublin, 1593-1846 (London, Williams and Norgate), edited by the late George D. Burtchaell, K.C., and Thomas U. Sadleir, gives details respecting each man similar to those in Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*; not a few names are those of Americans, or are connected with American history.

An Historical Atlas of South Africa, by Eric A. Walker, containing twenty-six maps with explanatory letterpress, is published by the Oxford University Press.

In that series of the *Historical Records of Australia* (Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament) which consists of despatches and papers relating to the settlement of the states other than New South Wales (series III.) a second volume has been issued, covering the history of Tasmania from July, 1812, to the end of 1819.

The latest issue in the series of *Helps for Students of History* (S. P. C. K., Macmillan) is *The Colonial Entry-Books*, by C. S. S. Higham, of the University of Manchester.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. E. N. Wheeler and P. G. Laver, *Roman Colchester* (*Journal of Roman Studies*, IX. 2); M. Treiter, *Die Urkundendatierung in Angelsächsischer Zeit nebst Überblick über die Datierung in der Anglo-Normannischen Periode* (*Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, VII. 2-3); R. N. Sauvage, *La Tapisserie de la Reine Mathilde à Bayeux* (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*,

LXXXII. 1-3); Felix Liebermann, *New Light on Medieval England* (Quarterly Review, October); M. H. Mills, "*Adventus Vicecomitum*", 1258-1272 (English Historical Review, October); J. E. Neale, *Parliament and the Succession Question in 1562/3 and 1566* (*ibid.*, October); C. E. Fayle, *The Ship-Money Fleets* (Edinburgh Review, October); H. P. K. Skipton, *Little Gidding and the Non-Jurors* (Church Quarterly Review, October); G. N. Clark, *Trading with the Enemy and the Corunna Packets, 1689-1697* (English Historical Review, October); J. A. R. Marriott, *The Party System and Parliamentary Government* (Edinburgh Review, October); Algernon Cecil, *Cardinal Manning* (Quarterly Review, October); Charlotte Mendelsohn, *Wandlungen des Liberalen England durch die Kriegswirtschaft* (Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, XVIII.); L. Paul-Dubois, *Le Drame Irlandais, I. Les Origines, 1914-1918; II. Le Sinn Féin, 1918-1921* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15, October 1).

FRANCE

General review: H. Hauser, *Histoire de France; Époque Moderne, jusqu'en 1660* (Revue Historique, May).

The American Anthropological Association and the Archaeological Institute of America have joined in establishing an American School of Prehistoric Studies in France. Dr. Henri Martin, former president of the Société Préhistorique de France, has given to the new school the opportunity of making extensive excavations at a promising site in the department of the Charente.

The Oxford University Press has published this autumn the first volume (1483-1493) of a *History of France from the Death of Louis XI.*, by John S. C. Bridge.

R. de Boysson's *L'Invasion Calviniste en Bas-Limousin, Périgord, et Haut-Quercy* (Paris, Picard, 1920, pp. 458) is really an account of the wars of religion from a Catholic point of view, frankly hostile to Protestantism.

E. Berger has published the second volume of the late Léopold Delisle's *Recueil des Actes de Henri II.* (Paris, Klincksieck, pp. vi, 465).

Oeuvres du Cardinal de Retz: Supplément à la Correspondance (Paris, Hachette, 1920, pp. xii, 328), by C. Cochin, is a posthumous publication of the Retz documents which he found in the archives of the Vatican, of the Medici, and of the Este, all hitherto unavailable. It is enriched with good notes and several appendixes and forms a monument to patience and scholarship.

After an interval of four years two more volumes, XI. and XII., of the French Academy's *Correspondance de Bossuet* (Paris, Hachette, 1920, pp. 510, 512) have appeared. The editors are C. Urbain and E.

Levesque. They cover the period from December, 1698, to December, 1700, and include 276 letters, many of which were not available before.

A double number, nos. 1 and 2 of vol. VI., of the *Smith College Studies in History* (pp. 184), is devoted to a monograph in French on *Le Dernier Séjour de J.-J. Rousseau à Paris, 1770-1778*, by Elizabeth A. Foster.

Abbé E. Lavaquery has published *Le Cardinal de Boisgelin, 1732-1804* (Paris, Plon, 1921, 2 vols., pp. 410 and 412), an erudite biography of the ambitious archbishop of Aix, whose lack of character it tends to excuse rather too much. It throws much light on the history of society in the eighteenth century.

Messrs. Heinemann have lately published *The Life of Danton* by Louis Madelin, translated into English by Lady Mary Loyd.

Abbé M. Giraud has prepared an *Essai sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la Sarthe, de 1789 à l'an IV.* (Paris, Jouve, 1920, pp. 691), with impartiality and moderation of statement touching a period which easily lends itself to a different treatment. *Le Régime de la Liberté de Cultes dans le Département du Calvados pendant la Première Séparation, 1795 à 1802* (Paris, Alcan, 1921, pp. 290), by R. Patry, likewise shows conscientious use of all available material.

Bonaparte au Siège de Toulon (Toulon, Mouton et Combe, 1921) by Commandant Nel (J. Norel) is a critical study of the terrain, an investigation of the manner in which Bonaparte chanced to be there, and a capable narrative of the military events. A. Chuquet's *Le Départ de l'Île d'Elbe* (Paris, Leroux, 1921, pp. 210) is a fresh investigation of the events preceding the return and of the motives which prompted it. Other books on Napoleon worthy of notice are *Napoléon d'après le Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène* (Paris, Delagrave, 1921, pp. viii, 300) by Captain M. Gagneur, and Lacour-Gayet's *Bonaparte, Membre de l'Institut* (Paris, Gauthier-Villars, 1921, pp. ii, 94).

Gambetta and the Foundation of the Third Republic, by H. Stannard (London, Methuen), gives the first detailed account in English of Gambetta's creation of a French national army after Sedan.

The years since the separation of church and state, and the adaptation of the two institutions to the new relationship, are dealt with by P. Bureau in *Quinze Années de Séparation* (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1921).

The third volume of *Les Bouches-du-Rhône, Encyclopédie Départementale* (Marseilles, 1921, pp. 868), edited by P. Masson, deals with *Les Temps Modernes, 1482-1789*. Twenty chapters out of twenty-eight are by Raoul Busquet, archivist of the department, and are devoted to a history of the institutions of Provence. It is not only the largest but the most original contribution, and comprises the fullest and most trustworthy account that has appeared. Busquet's chapters have been pub-

lished separately under the title *Histoire des Institutions de la Provence de 1482 à 1790* (Marseille, Barlatier, 1920, pp. 365).

The history of the oldest organization of its character is to be found in J. Fournier's *La Chambre de Commerce de Marseille et ses Représentants Permanents à Paris, 1599-1875* (Marseille, Barlatier, 1920, pp. 334). It is important for the history of French commerce as well as for its local interests. Another book of somewhat similar interest is *Souvenirs de Marseille et des Échelles du Levant au XVIII^e Siècle; Deux Consuls Marseillais en Levant: un Courtier de Commerce et un Notaire Marseillais sous la Révolution* (Marseille, Barlatier, 1921, pp. 111) by L. Bergasse.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Levillain, *Études sur l'Abbaye de Saint-Denis à l'Époque Mérovingienne* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, LXXXII, 1-3); K. Federn, *Das Vermögen und die Geschäfte des Kardinals Mazarin* (Preussische Jahrbücher, August); L. Dubreuil, *L'Élection de Buzot à la Convention* (Annales Révolutionnaires, September); A. Mathiez, *Les Enragés contre la Constitution de 1793* (*ibid.*, July); *id.*, *Les Enragés et les Troubles du Savon, Juin 1793* (*ibid.*, September); L. Dumont-Wilden, *Napoléon et le Prince de Ligne* (Revue Critique, June); Saint-Denis dit Ali, *Souvenirs du Second Mameluck de l'Empereur: III. Waterloo, vers Sainte-Hélène; IV. La Vie à Sainte-Hélène; V. Les Derniers Jours, les Funérailles* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1, September 1, October 1); A. Augustin-Thierry, *Augustin Thierry d'après sa Correspondance, I. La Jeunesse* (*ibid.*, October 15); V. Giraud, *Nos Grands Chefs, I., II. Le Général Castelnau* (*ibid.*, August 1, 15).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

An attempt to trace the influence of physical factors in historical development is made by A. von Hoffmann in *Das Land Italien und seine Geschichte: eine Historisch-Topographische Darstellung* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1921, pp. 458).

A. de Bouard has written *Le Régime Politique et les Institutions de Rome au Moyen Age, 1252-1347* (Paris, Boccard, 1920, pp. xxx, 362).

M. Blanchard, *Bibliographie Critique de l'Histoire des Routes des Alpes Occidentales sous l'État de Piémont-Savoie, XVII^e-XVIII^e Siècles, et à l'Époque Napoléonienne, 1796-1815* (Grenoble, Allier, 1920, pp. 120), is a valuable treatise on the sources for the study of public travel over the Alps.

In the *Colección de Documentos para el Estudio de la Historia de Aragón*, edited by E. Ibarra, D. Sangorrín has published volume XII, *El Libro de Cadena del Concejo de Jaca* (Zaragoza, 1920, pp. 392). The editing is capable and the transcription faithful. The result is a piece of work valuable for the period from the tenth to the fourteenth century.

L. Pfandl has published in book form *Itinerarium Hispanicum Hieronymi Monetarii, 1494-1495* (Paris, Paillart, 1920, pp. 180), which first appeared in the *Revue Hispanique*.

The most recent Portuguese historical works of importance are: *A Rainha D. Leonor, 1458-1525* (Lisbon, Portugalia Editora, 1921, pp. 400), by the Conde de Sabugosa, a somewhat rhetorical biography of the queen (and cousin) of King John III.; *O General Visconde de Leiria: Retalhos de Historia Contemporanea* (Lisbon, Ferin, 1920, pp. 719), the life of one who (b. 1794, d. 1873) fought in the Peninsular War against Napoleon and had an important part, on the Constitutionalist side, in the internal wars and politics of the ensuing period, written by Sr. Alexandre Cabral, husband of his granddaughter; and *D. Pedro V. e o seu Reinado, 1853-1861* (Coimbra, Imprensa da Universidade, 1921, two vols., pp. 399, 463), by Sr. Júlio de Vilhena, of the Academy.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir Denison Ross, *Portuguese Relations with India and Arabia, 1507-1517* (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1921, part IV.).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

An attempt to show the relation of the course of German history to geographical conditions is made by A. von Hofmann in *Das Deutsche Land und die Deutsche Geschichte* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1920, pp. 603).

A very competent survey of the whole history of autobiography in Germany is presented in *Die Deutsche Selbstbiographie*, by Dr. Theodor Klaiher (Stuttgart, Metzler).

A third edition of R. Munch's masterly treatment of *Deutsche Stammeskunde* (Berlin, Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1920, pp. I, 443) has appeared. The second edition was published sixteen years ago. There is new discussion of questions relating to Germanic origins.

Two accounts of German literature in the Middle Age are *Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur bis zur Mitte des XI. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1920, pp. ix, 261) by W. Unwerth and T. Siebs, and *Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur, I. Vom 9. Jahrhundert bis zu den Staufern* (Berlin, Ebering, 1920, pp. vii, 512) by S. Aschner.

The third volume of Berger's *Martin Luther in Kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung* (Berlin, Hofmann, 1921) covers the years 1532 to 1546. Hartmann Grisar and F. Heege have published *Luthers Kampfbilder, I. Passional Christi und Antichristi; Eröffnung des Bilderkampfes, 1521* (Freiburg, Herder, 1921, pp. xii, 68). Another book on Luther is Jordan's *Luther und der Bann in seinen und seiner Zeitgenossen Aussagen* (Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, 1920). Other phases

of the Reformation are studied by L. Lehmann in *Bilder aus der Reformationsgeschichte der Mark Brandenburg* (Berlin, Vaterländische Verlags- und Kunstanstalt, 1921); by R. Bottachiari in *Da Worms a Weimar: Contributo alla Storia dello Spirito et della Civiltà Germanica* (Bologna, Oberosler, 1920); and by K. Bauer in *Die Beziehungen Calvins zu Frankfurt am Main* (Leipzig, Heinsius, 1921).

A recent study in German constitutional history is P. Haake's *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte vom Anfange des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1921).

The first volume of J. B. Kissling's *Geschichte der Deutschen Katholikentage*, prepared under the auspices of the executive committee of the German Catholic General Assembly (Münster, Aschendorff, 1920, pp. xvi, 506), brings the account as far as 1849. It is important for the historical background and the origins of the Centre party.

The Kulturkampf and the war scare of 1875 are dealt with in *Vom Bismarck der 70er Jahre* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1920) by A. Wahl.

Under the direction of his widow a collection of the minor writings of Gustav von Schmoller, the noted economist and parliamentarian, has been published under the title *Zwanzig Jahre Deutscher Politik, 1897-1917* (Munich, Duncker und Humblot, 1921, pp. vi, 206). The articles are not intimately associated in subject-matter or in time. Some of the more significant of them, from the historical point of view, are on the Economic Future of Germany and her Fleet, 1899; Common Interests of Germany and Austria, 1909; Prussian Election Reforms, 1910; Social Democrats in the Reichstag, 1912; the Patriotic Attitude of the Social Democrats at the beginning of the War, and a Résumé of the Development of the Party in Germany. A particularly interesting paper (1913) has to do with the danger of war. It sets forth the development of international tension as a result of the democratization of constitutions and the influence of capital, and concludes that some questions having to do with the life of a nation are too large to be settled in any manner other than by war.

As is customary after a period of sharp crisis there is a flood of memoirs appearing in Germany. An important publication is the third volume of H. von Eckardstein's memoirs under the title *Die Isolierung Deutschlands* (Leipzig, List, 1921). A. Winnig has published *Am Ausgang der Deutschen Ostpolitik: Persönliche Erlebnisse und Erinnerungen* (Berlin, Staats-Politischer Verlag, 1921, pp. 125). The second edition of *Die Alte Generation, nach Familienbriefen und eigenen Erinnerungen* (Braunschweig, Maus, 1920, pp. 286), by Bertha von Kröcher, not only deals with the old Mark family of Kröcher and a branch of the Gerlach family, but shows how the circles once Christian-Conservative became Christian-Socialist in politics.

A phase of recent German revolution is dealt with by Maercker in *Vom Kaiserheer zur Reichswehr: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Deutschen Revolution* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1921).

Various phases of the history of socialism are set forth in G. Mayer's *Friedrich Engels: eine Biographie*, the first volume of which, *Friedrich Engels in seiner Frühzeit, 1820-1851* (Berlin, Springer, 1920, pp. xiv, 317), is warmly praised by Kautsky; Oswald Spengler's *Preussentum und Sozialismus* (Munich, Beck, 1920, pp. 99); and Dörzbacher's *Die Deutsche Sozialdemokratie und die Nationale Machtpolitik bis 1914* (Gotha, Perthes, 1920).

With the collaboration of a number of archivists C. Schmidt has published *Les Sources de l'Histoire des Territoires Rhénans de 1792 à 1914 dans les Archives Rhénanes et à Paris* (Paris, Rieder, 1921, pp. 332). It is a detailed account of the materials in the archives at Paris, Trier, Coblenz, Darmstadt, Mainz, Wiesbaden, Dusseldorf, and Speyer. In a general introduction the editor gives an historical résumé of the administration of the area under occupation.

The fifth volume of the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stadt Mainz*, subsidized by the city, is *Die Stadt Mainz unter Kurfürstlicher Verwaltung, 1462-1792* (Mainz, Wilckens, 1920, pp. x, 252) by H. Schrohe, a remarkably well-executed piece of research.

W. E. Oefterings has written *Der Umsturz 1918 in Baden* (Constance, Reuss und Itta, 1920, pp. 304), which recounts the events of the revolution from early in November, 1918, to January, 1919. Documents on the revolution of 1848-1849 in Baden are published by F. Lautenschlager in *Volksstaat und Einherrschaft* (Constance, Reuss und Itta, 1920, pp. 507). A new *Badische Geschichte* (Berlin, Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1921) has been prepared by Krieger.

On May 16, 1920, the Swiss electorate, by a vote of 416,870 against 323,719, voted to ratify the federal decree which provided for the entrance of Switzerland into the League of Nations. Since one of the chief arguments of the opposition was that such adhesion was inconsistent with the traditional neutrality of Switzerland, Professor Charles Borgeaud, of Geneva, published an historical pamphlet to sustain the contrary opinion. A second edition of this, *La Neutralité Suisse au Centre de la Société des Nations: Notice Historique* (Geneva, Atar, pp. 107), expounding the history of Swiss neutrality, has now been published.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Rörig, *Die Hanse, ihre Europäische und Nationale Bedeutung* (Deutsche Rundschau, September); G. B. Volz, *Die Auswärtige Politik Friedrichs des Grossen* (ibid., September); S. Kähler, *Das Preussisch-Deutsche Problem seit der Reichsgründung* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); P. Lenel, *Beiträge zur Biographie des Preussischen Staatsrats von Rehder* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXIV. 2).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Volume XLI. of the *Bijdragen en Mededeelingen* of the Utrecht Historical Society is mostly occupied with material from the archives of Amsterdam and of Haarlem relating to the trials and executions of the Dutch Anabaptists, from 1533 to 1539.

The subtitle of M. des Ombiaux's *La Politique Belge depuis l'Armistice: la Grande Peur de la Victoire* (Paris, Bossard, 1921, pp. 200) indicates the thesis of the book, viz., that King Albert feared a revolution that might overthrow his throne. The author details the political moves that were, in his judgment, inspired by that fear.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

A study of the origin and significance of the famous *Lex Regia* of Frederick III. is published by K. Fabricius, *Kongeloven, dens Tilblivelse og Plads i Samtidens Natur- og Arveretlige Udvikling* (Copenhagen, Hagerup, 1920, pp. xvi, 407).

A translation into French of S. Askenazy's *Le Prince Joseph Poniatowski, Maréchal de France, 1763-1813* (Paris, Plon, 1921, pp. 346), has appeared.

S. de Chessin, who has previously published a volume on the first phases of the Russian revolution, has now prepared *L'Apocalypse Russe: la Révolution Bolchevique, 1918-1921* (Paris, Plon, 1921, pp. xxiv, 336). Another recent book on the revolution worthy of notice is *La Révolution et la Russie* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. x, 316) by Nicolas Kahratchevsky.

Mr. I. V. Hessen, formerly editor of *Rech*, the organ of the Cadet Party in St. Petersburg, is producing a series of volumes whose object is to present eye-witness accounts of some of the more important incidents of the post-revolutionary period, *Archiw Russkoi Revolutzii* (Berlin, Slovo), of which two volumes, containing many interesting narratives of the sort indicated, have already been published.

Maj.-Gen. Sir Alfred Knox, K.C.B., C.M.G., who had been for more than three years military attaché of the British embassy at Petrograd before hostilities broke out in 1914, accompanied the Russian army on intimate terms from the beginning of the war until the Bolshevik *coup d'état* in 1917. The two volumes which he now publishes, *With the Russian Army, 1914-1917* (London, Hutchinson, pp. 750), are of the greatest interest and value.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Stern, *L'Insurrection Polonoise de 1863 et l'Impératrice Eugénie* (*Revue Historique*, May); Peter Struve, *The Russian Communistic Experiment* (*Edinburgh Review*, October); S. Zagorsky, *L'Évolution Actuelle du Bolchevisme* (*Revue d'Économie Politique*, May).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Charles Richet in *Les Tchéco-Slovaques* (Paris, Perrin) gives an account of the renaissance of Bohemia from the sixteenth to the twentieth century, and discusses the difficulties in organizing the new state.

Milanko Vesnitch, who represented Serbia at Paris from 1904 to 1921, published, just before his death, *La Serbie à travers la Guerre* (Paris, Bossard, pp. xii, 162), an able statement of Serbia's case. *Le Royaume des Serbes, Croates et Slovènes* (Paris, Bossard, 1921, pp. 316) is a new book by A. Mousset, who occupied a position where he could observe and judge events without losing his freedom to comment.

P. Loti in *Suprêmes Visions d'Orient: Fragments de Journal Intime* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1921) tells with incomparable charm his impressions of Turkey in 1910 and 1913.

A recent book on modern Greek history is *Les Régimes Gouvernementaux de la Grèce de 1821 à nos Jours* (Paris, 1921) by Conclelis.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Lechat, *Lettres de Jean de Tagliacozzo sur le Siège de Belgrade et la Mort de S. Jean de Capistran* (Analecta Bollandiana, XXXIX, 1-2); *Posthumous Memoirs of Talaat Pasha* (Current History, November).

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

General review: P. Masson-Oursel, *Philosophies de l'Orient* (Revue Philosophique, September).

A serious and intelligent study of *La Résurrection Géorgienne* (Paris, Leroux, 1921, pp. xiii, 318) is published by P. Gentizon who was sent by the *Temps* to Georgia, as the state which showed the most vitality and political capacity of any in the Caucasus group. W. Woytinski in *La Démocratie Géorgienne* (Paris, Alcan, 1921, pp. vii, 304) discusses not only recent events in Georgia but its past relations with Russia, its ethnic unity, and its economic condition.

The first volume of the *Cambridge History of India*, edited by Professor E. J. Rapson (Cambridge University Press), is published at about this time. It brings the history of ancient India from the earliest times to about the middle of the first century A. D. The contributors are such scholars as Sir Halford MacKinder, the Master of Emmanuel College (Dr. Peter Giles), Dr. and Mrs. T. W. Rhys Davids, Professor E. W. Hopkins, Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, and Mr. Edwyn R. Bevan.

A new periodical, entitled *Journal of Indian History*, to be published three times yearly by the University of Allahabad and edited by Shafaat Ahmad Khan, professor of modern European history in that university, made its appearance in November. The editor himself contributes the first four articles, dealing with British India and the East Indian trade in the seventeenth century.

The Hakluyt Society has issued the second and concluding volume of Mr. M. L. Dames's valuable annotated translation of *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, mainly concerned with the Malabar Coast during the long period of the author's residence there.

Mr. John Murray has published a volume by Vice-Admiral George A. Ballard on *The Influence of the Sea on the Political History of Japan*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Col. T. E. Lawrence, *Arabian Nights and Days* (World's Work, September); *id.*, *Adventures in Arabia's Deliverance* (*ibid.*, October); P. S. Reinsch, *The Rise and Fall of Yuan Shih-Kai* (Asia, December).

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

Georges Hardy, director of public instruction in Morocco, who combines ripe scholarship with years of colonial experience, has published in rapid succession four volumes, *Les Éléments de l'Histoire Coloniale* (Paris, Renaissance du Livre, 1921, pp. 180); *L'Enseignement au Sénégal de 1817 à 1854* (Paris, Larose, 1921, pp. v, 148); *La Mise en Valeur du Sénégal de 1817 à 1854* (*ibid.*, pp. xxxiii, 376); *Les Grandes Étapes de l'Histoire du Maroc* (*ibid.*, pp. 136).

Mr. H. A. MacMichael, assistant civil secretary in Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, has nearly ready for publication two volumes, largely based on native records, of *A History of the Arabs in the Sudan* (Cambridge University Press).

M. Sabry in the second part of *La Révolution Égyptienne* (Paris, Vrin, 1921, pp. 277) has treated in a clear style of the relations of the British Empire with Egypt since the armistice—of the attempted revolution, the futile appeal to the Peace Conference, the Milner mission, the boycott of that mission, and subsequent events.

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The director of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington returned from Europe in November, after having spent three months in London in the collection of material for the earlier volumes of the *Correspondence of the British Ministers in Washington*, and after brief visits to the chief Spanish archives. Miss Elizabeth Donnan, of Wellesley College, returning temporarily to the work of the department, spent the summer in the search for additional materials, among the papers of the Royal African Company in the Public Record Office, and in the British Museum, for her volumes of documents respecting the African slave-trade to English America. For the series of volumes of the *Correspondence of Andrew*

Jackson, all letters of Jackson thus far found have been copied, and about two-thirds of those letters to Jackson which are to be printed. The second volume of Dr. Burnett's *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* has gone to the printer.

Following are some recent accessions of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress: Letter-books of John Bradford, Continental agent for prizes at Boston, two volumes, 1776-1782; letter-book of Samuel Bradford, United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, one volume, 1796-1804; typewritten copies of correspondence of Col. Nicolas Fish, one volume, 1785-1786; a collection of more than a hundred broadside acts, bills, and committee reports of Congress, 1789-1810; letters from John Marshall to his wife, 1797-1831; letters from various Presidents to the commissioners of the District of Columbia and others, one volume, 1791-1869; J. R. Murray's diary of travels in Europe, 1799, two volumes; papers of Oliver Wendell Holmes, seven volumes; papers of George A. Trenholme, 1853-1897; the George H. Stuart Collection (Christian Commission), 1861-1877, two volumes and unbound letters; and photostat copies of the following: letters from Braxton Bragg to his wife, 1861-1863 (22 pieces, from originals in the collection of W. K. Bixby), Beauregard's report on the bombardment of Fort Sumter, Apr. 16, 1861 (from the same collection), and miscellaneous papers and letters of Col. John S. Mosby, 1861-1886 (35 pieces). It is to be noted also that the original Declaration of Independence and the original Constitution of the United States have been transferred to the library from the Department of State, by presidential order.

Though this journal has an opportunity, each quarter, through the kindness of the chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, to note briefly the most important of its many accessions, attention may well be called to the fuller description of those of the last year which is to be found on pp. 28-45 of the *Report* of the librarian for 1921; also, to a valuable report on the transcription of documents from French archives, by Mr. Waldo G. Leland, printed as an appendix, on pp. 177-186.

The Knights of Columbus Historical Commission offers five prizes, ranging in amount from \$3000 to \$500, for the best unpublished studies, based on research in primary sources, in the field of American history, submitted respectively by (1) professors or instructors in history or other social sciences in the colleges of the United States, (2) other specialists in history or other social sciences, (3) scholars and graduate students having access to material in Hispanic America, dealing with the international relations of the Americas, (4) school superintendents and teachers—on matters within the school curricula, and (5) undergraduate students in colleges. There is also provision for a co-operation not competitive in character, the object being the encouragement of

historical investigation. Studies submitted in competition must be sent to the commission on or before May 31, 1922. Descriptive circulars may be obtained by addressing the commission at 199 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston.

A new edition of Professor John S. Bassett's *Short History of the United States* brings the narrative down to the election of President Harding (Macmillan).

The house of Badger (Boston) has brought out *The American Dictionary of Dates*, in three volumes, compiled by Charles R. Damon.

Professor Waldo S. Pratt, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, has edited, and the Macmillan Company has published, an *American Supplement*, in one volume (pp. vi, 412), to Grove's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, which contains on the one hand a great mass of newly collected biographical information, and on the other hand a valuable series of chapters and essays on the history of music in America.

Volume VI., no. 3, of *Smith College Studies in History* is *Letters of Ann Gillam Storrow to Jared Sparks*, edited, with an introduction, by Frances B. Blanshard. The letters, beginning in 1820 and, with one exception (1857), ending in 1846, give interesting glimpses of the intellectual world in and about Boston. No. 4 of the *Studies* is *The Westover Journal of John A. Selden, Esqr., 1858-1862*, with an introduction and notes by Professor John S. Bassett.

In the June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* are found some Notes on Franco-American Relations in 1778, compiled from contemporary sources by Miss Elizabeth S. Kite. The letters of Francis Patrick Kenrick to the Allen family are continued, this installment being of the years 1857-1860.

The *Journal* of the Presbyterian Historical Society for September and December contains the conclusion of Professor Frederick W. Loetscher's article on Presbyterianism in Colonial New England; it also begins the printing of the *Journal* of Rev. Lemuel Foster, who came to Illinois in 1832 as a home missionary and wrote an account of his experiences, which was continued, after his death in 1872, by his wife.

The *Transactions* of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina, no. 25, embodies the proceedings of the society in 1919 and 1920, of which the most significant feature was the celebration, Apr. 10-13, 1920 (deferred from April, 1919), of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Admiral Gaspard de Coligny. A number of historical addresses of value and interest were delivered in connection with the celebration, among which we note the Huguenots of New Paltz, by Hon. Ralph LeFevre, of New Paltz, N. Y., and the Family of Coligny

and the Colonial Policy of the Admiral, by Col. William Gaspard de Coligny, of Hendersonville, N. C.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

In commemoration of the Pilgrim Tercentenary, the University of Illinois Press has published a booklet, of 48 pages, containing an excellent address on the Place of the Pilgrims in American History, by Professor Evarts B. Greene.

In *A Day in a Colonial Home* (Boston, Marshall Jones, 1921), Della R. Prescott has given a simple sketch of a day's activities in a colonial household and added an appendix showing how a typical New England kitchen of the eighteenth century may be reconstructed in a school, library or museum.

Volume V. of Professor Edward Channing's *History of the United States* has appeared (Macmillan). The volume covers the period 1815-1848 and bears the subtitle *The Period of Transition*.

The life of *Chief Justice Roger B. Taney*, on which Dr. Bernard C. Steiner has long been engaged, is now in press (Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins Company).

The Atlantic Monthly Press announces the *Life and Letters of Henry Lee Higginson*, prepared by Dr. Bliss Perry.

Roosevelt in the Kansas City Star: War-Time Editorials by Theodore Roosevelt, edited, with an introduction, by Ralph Stout, and *Roosevelt in the Bad Lands*, by Herman Hagedorn, are among the publications of the Roosevelt Memorial Association, and from the press of the Houghton Mifflin Company. Charles Scribner's Sons have brought out *My Brother, Theodore Roosevelt*, by Mrs. Corinne Roosevelt Robinson. The Rev. Dr. Ferdinand C. Ingelhart has published his recollections of Roosevelt under the title *Theodore Roosevelt: the Man as I knew him* (New York, Burt). *Quentin Roosevelt: a Sketch, with Letters*, edited by Kermit Roosevelt, comprises letters written by Quentin Roosevelt while in the training camps and in France (Scribner).

Woodrow Wilson's Administration and Achievements: being a Compilation from the Newspaper Press of Eight Years of the World's Greatest History, compiled by F. B. Lord and J. W. Bryan, is brought out in Washington by the J. W. Bryan Press (513 Eleventh Street, N.W.).

The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page, late American ambassador to Great Britain, by Burton J. Hendrick, will be published in book form when the serial publication of Mr. Page's letters in the *World's Work* is completed.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE GREAT WAR

Aided by a bequest of the late Gen. George W. Cullum, his *Biographical Register of Officers and Graduates of the U. S. Military Academy* has been supplemented by an addition, called volume VI. and bound in two volumes. Coming to the year 1920, it gives the record of all graduates of the academy in the Great War. The editor is Col. Wirt Robinson.

The Quartermaster Corps in the Year 1917 in the World War is by Henry G. Sharpe, formerly quartermaster general, U. S. A. (New York, Century Company).

The National Catholic War Council has brought out through the Macmillan Company *American Catholics in the War*, by Michael Williams.

The Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out a *History of the American Field Service in France, "Friends of France", 1914-1917*, in three volumes, told by its members and edited by J. W. D. Seymour.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

An attractive story of an out-of-the-way locality in eastern Maine has been written by Miss Minnie Atkinson, with affectionate interest, in *Hinckley Township, or Grand Lake Stream Plantation* (Newburyport, Mass., Herald Press, pp. 122, with many illustrations).

In the October number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* the papers of G. G. Putnam on Salem Vessels and Voyages are continued, as are also the Old Norfolk County Records, and there is a first installment of materials relating to the Essex Guard (War of 1812), compiled by Lieut.-Col. L. W. Jenkins.

The Connecticut organization called the Governor's Independent Volunteer Troop of Horse Guards, instituted in 1788, served for some years on formal occasions as escort and the like, became dormant after one generation, and in 1911 was revived as Troop B, Cavalry, of the Connecticut National Guard. *The Origin and Fortunes of Troop B*, edited by James L. Howard (Hartford, Case, Lockwood, and Brainard Co., pp. 261), recounts its history, chiefly by printing the annual historians' chronicles. The only active service seems to have been that of 1916 on the Mexican border.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The latest publication of the state historian of New York is an *Historical Account and Inventory of the Records of Suffolk County* (eastern portion of Long Island), prepared by the county clerk.

In the April number of the *Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association* are found the interesting address delivered by Dr. James Sullivan before the association in October, 1920, on Sectionalism in Writing History—Shirley and Johnson; a paper by Harry E. Barnes on the Origins of Prison Reform in New York State; and one by Mr. A. J. F. van Laer on the Schoolmaster's Lot at New Paltz.

The principal contents of the October number of the *New York Historical Society Bulletin* are an article by Charles X. Harris on Pieter Vanderlyn, Portrait Painter, and some Notes on American Artists, compiled by the late William Kelby.

The October number of the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* contains an address by Hon. R. Wayne Parker entitled New Jersey in the Colonial Wars; a paper by J. F. Folsom on the Preakness Valley and Reminiscences of Washington's Headquarters in the Dey Mansion; Propositions of Gawen Lawrie for the Settlement of East Jersey, 1682; and a letter from Charles Thomson to his wife, August 21, 1783, relative to fixing the residence of Congress.

Two valuable contributions appear in the January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, James Wilson and James Iredell: a Parallel and a Contrast, by Hon. Hampton L. Carson, and Charles Lee: Stormy Petrel of the Revolution, by Edward Robins. The April number contains the journal of Col. John May of Boston, concerning a journey to the Ohio country in 1789. The correspondence of Thomas Rodney, contributed by Mr. Simon Gratz, is continued to 1810.

The Pennsylvania History Press, Haverford, Pennsylvania, has published *The Forks of the Delaware, 1794-1811: Chronicles of Early Travel to Easton and neighboring Parts of Pennsylvania and New Jersey*, a paper read by Professor R. W. Kelsey before the Northampton County Historical and Genealogical Society in November, 1919.

The contents of the October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* include a paper, by Harry E. Barnes, on the Evolution of American Penology as illustrated by the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania; one by Frank R. Murdock on Some Aspects of Pittsburgh's Industrial Contribution to the World War; a brief sketch, by B. F. Pershing, of Edgar A. Cowan, United States senator from Pennsylvania, 1861-1867; and a short paper, by Clarence R. Thayer, on George Croghan and the Struggle for the Ohio Valley, 1748-1758. In the table of contents, in the title, and in the running headlines, the name is printed "Groghan".

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

In the September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* are found the second part of William B. Marye's paper on the Baltimore County "Garrison" and the Old Garrison Roads, a continuation of Edward S. Delaplaine's Life of Thomas Jefferson, and some Notes from the Early Records of Maryland, by Jane B. Cotton.

Potomac Landings is the title of a narrative and picture history, by Paul Wiltstach, of the famous old manor houses on the great plantations along the Potomac in colonial times (Doubleday, Page).

In the October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* A. J. Morrison presents a paper on the Virginia Indian Trade to 1673, which, the author states, "is to serve by way of preface to a rather close investigation of the Southern Indian Trade from 1673 to 1763". The Professional Biography of Moncure Robinson (1802-1891), a noted civil engineer, is a reprint of the biography by R. B. Osborne (1889). The *Magazine* prints, from the Dawson Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, some letters (1745-1758) of Patrick Henry, sr., Samuel Davies, James Maury, Edwin Conway, and George Trask.

Historical articles in the October number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* are: Ideals of America; Virginia, Founder of the World's Navies; and Correspondence relating to Lord Botetourt. There is also a genealogical account of the Lanier family.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* continues in the April number the correspondence of Ralph Izard and Henry Laurens, printing a number of letters of Izard to Laurens during 1777. The *Magazine* presents some documents (1764-1765) pertaining to the Excommunication of Joseph Ash, with a note by Judge Henry A. M. Smith, and some documents (1735) relating to Landgrave Thomas Smith's Visit to Boston, contributed by Edward L. Smith.

WESTERN STATES

The June-September issue (double number) of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains two articles of monographic scope. They are: *In re* that Aggressive Slavocracy, by Chauncey S. Boucher, and the Political Career of Ignatius Donnelly, by John D. Hicks. The first is a well-reasoned argument in the negative, supported by much documentary evidence; the second, the interesting story of a Don Quixote in politics. Among the articles are also found an evaluation by L. B. Shippee, of Rhodes's *History of the United States*, as well as an account of the fourteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, held at Madison, Wisconsin, in April. In the department of Notes and Documents is an item of unusual interest and

value, Trudeau's Description of the Upper Missouri. The recent discovery of this document is related by Miss Annie H. Abel, who has efficiently edited it for the *Review*.

An extra number (November) of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains the Proceedings of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, 1919-1920. The historical papers which appear in this number are the following: the Timber Culture Acts, by William F. Raney; an Historical Detective Story, by Jacob P. Dunn; Elijah Clarke's Foreign Intrigues and the "Trans-Oconee Republic", by E. Merton Coulter; the Undertow of Puritan Influence, by Arthur L. Kohlmeier; the Moravian Mission Settlement in Indiana, by Arthur W. Brady; the Use, the Abuse, and the Writing of Textbooks in American History, by Wilmer C. Harris; How the War should affect the Teaching of History, by Herriot C. Palmer; the Trials of a History Teacher, by Charles Roll; Perils of River Navigation in the Sixties, by William C. Cochran; Dr. Josiah Gregg, Historian of the Old Santa Fé Trail, by William E. Connelley; the Construction of the Miami and Erie Canal, by Arthur H. Hirsch; and the Strategy of Concentration, as used by the Confederate Forces in the Mississippi Valley in the Spring of 1862, by Alfred P. James.

At a joint session of the Ohio Valley Historical Association and the Ohio History Teachers' Association held in Columbus November 11 and 12 the following historical papers were read: Céloron de Blainville and French Expansion in the Ohio Valley, by Professor G. A. Wood of Ohio State University; the Military Office in America, 1763-1775, by Professor Clarence E. Carter of Miami University; and Three Early Anti-Slavery Newspapers of the Ohio Valley, by Miss Annetta Walsh of North High School, Columbus.

The July number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* is given over entirely to papers and materials relating to John Brown. The principal paper is by C. B. Galbreath. An account of John Brown at Harper's Ferry and Charlestown is a lecture by Col. S. K. Donovan (died 1902), who went to Harper's Ferry as a newspaper correspondent immediately after the raid. There is also a reprint of the Execution of John Brown, by Murat Halstead.

The July-September number of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* contains the fourth installment of the Gano Papers. These are of the year 1813 and include correspondence of General John S. Gano with Governor Return J. Meigs, Brig.-Gens. Edmund Munger and John Wingate, and Col. Henry Brush.

The June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* contains the concluding installment of John E. Inglehart's monograph on Methodism in Southwestern Indiana; a discussion, by Logan Esarey, of the Ap-

proach to History; and the first part of a paper, by Charles H. Money, on the Fugitive Slave Law in Indiana. This paper is concluded in the September number, which also contains an account of New Albany and the Scribner Family, by Mary Scribner Davis Collins; and a sketch of Judge M. C. Eggleston, by Blanche G. Garber.

The *Centennial Memorial Volume* published by the Indiana University upon occasion of the commemoration which occurred in July, 1920, contains as part I, a history of the university, composed of six addresses delivered in 1889-1894 by the late Judge David D. Banta.

As a part of the seventy-fifth anniversary of Earlham College, a careful history of the institution is being prepared for publication by Professor Harlow Lindley.

The contents of the April (1920) number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* include: Some Pastors and Pastorates during the Century of Presbyterianism in Illinois, by Rev. James G. K. McClure; Old Time Campaigning and the Story of a Lincoln Campaign Song, by William H. Smith; and Pike County Settled 1820, by Jesse M. Thompson. The more important articles in the January number are: the address delivered by Lord Charnwood at the unveiling of the statue of Abraham Lincoln on the state house grounds, Oct. 6, 1918; In Meade's Camp: a Diary of the Civil War (February and March, 1864), by Robert M. Hatfield; the Story of the Baptist Church of Waterman, Illinois, by George E. Congdon; and the Spirit of '76 from the Green Mountains, by Gaius Paddock.

The Library of the University of Illinois has recently acquired the library of the Count Antonio Cavagna Sangiuliana di Gualdana (of La Gelada, Italy). The library is estimated to contain about 40,000 volumes, in addition to large collections of manuscripts, maps, and prints. It is especially rich in material for the study of Italian history, literature, and art.

In the September number of the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* William E. Railey's articles on Woodford County are concluded. Col. M. C. Taylor's Diary of the López expedition to Cuba (1850) is contributed by A. C. Quisenberry.

The *Michigan History Magazine* covers the year 1921 with two double numbers, January-April and July-October. Among the contents of the first are: New England Men in Michigan History, by William Stocking; Recollections of Zachariah Chandler, by O. E. McCutcheon; a Sketch of some Institutional Beginnings in Michigan, by W. O. Hedrick; and an account of Michigan War Legislation, 1919, by Charles Landrum. In the July-October issue are: A Daring Canadian Abolitionist (Alexander M. Ross), by Fred Landon; a Forgotten City (Port Sheldon), by Ralph C. Meima; and Overland to Michigan in 1846, by Miss Sue I. Silliman.

In 1918 the State Historical Society of Wisconsin published *The Movement for Statehood*, the first of four volumes designated the Constitutional Series. The second and third volumes of the series, *The Convention of 1846*, and *The Struggle over Ratification, 1846-1847*, have now been published, and the fourth, which will cover the debates in the second constitutional convention (1847 and 1848), together with the constitution as finally adopted, is ready for the press. The volumes are edited by Dr. M. M. Quaife. The *Proceedings* of the society for 1920, just issued, contains two historical papers. The one bears the title the Rump Council, and embraces the proceedings of the first legislative assembly held on the soil of Wisconsin Territory (at Green Bay, January, 1836). It is edited by Dr. Joseph Schafer. The other is a monograph by Dr. Schafer on Wisconsin's Farm Loan Law, 1849-1863. At the annual meeting of the society, October 20, Miss Louise P. Kellogg delivered the address, which was in memory of the character and services of Dr. Lyman C. Draper.

The September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* contains the story of How Wisconsin Women won the Ballot, by Theodora W. Youmans; a sketch, by W. W. Bartlett, of Jean Brunet, Chippewa Valley Pioneer; and an account, by Dr. M. M. Quaife, of Wisconsin's First Literary Magazine. The papers by W. A. Titus on Historic Spots in Wisconsin are continued, as are also the letters of Chauncey H. Cooke, "the Badger Boy in Blue". There are also two items relative to the Chicago convention of 1860, the one a letter from Charles C. Sholes to James R. Doolittle, May 21, 1860, the other some Personal Recollections by Amherst W. Kellogg.

Articles in the November number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* are: the Family Trail through American History, by Cyril A. Herrick, and the Early Norwegian Press in America, by Theodore C. Blegen. The *Twenty-First Biennial Report* of the Minnesota Historical Society appears as an extra number (October) of the *Bulletin*.

The November number of the *Palimpsest* contains an account of Old Fort Atkinson, by Bruce E. Mahan, and some newspaper excerpts relative to the beginnings of Burlington.

Following are the contents of the October number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*: Conditions in Texas affecting the Colonization Problem, 1795-1801, by Mattie A. Hatcher; a first installment of the Correspondence of Guy M. Bryan and Rutherford B. Hayes (1843-1849); Early Irrigation in Texas, by Edwin P. Arneson; and the Journal of Lewis Birdsall Harris, 1836-1842.

Harper and Brothers have published *The Party of the Third Part: the Story of the Kansas Industrial Relations Court*, by Henry J. Allen.

The *Nebraska Blue Book and Historical Register, 1920* (pp. 536), edited by Addison E. Sheldon, contains besides the usual conspectus of state government, central and local, some items of an historical sort:

for instance, an historical sketch of Nebraska, a history of the capitol, of the state seal and flower, an historical roster of officers, and a brief military history of the state. There is also a sketch of the constitutional history of the state, with the constitution of 1875 as amended by the convention of 1919.

James H. McClintock of Phoenix, Arizona, is the author and publisher of *Mormon Settlement in Arizona: a Record of Peaceful Conquest of the Desert*.

The principal articles in the October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are one by Judge F. W. Howay entitled Captains Gray and Kendrick: the Barrell Letters, pertaining to the voyage of the *Columbia* and *Washington* (1787-1790); one by W. P. Bonney, on Naming Stampede Pass; and one by John T. Condon on the Oregon Laws of 1845.

The September number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* contains a monograph, by Andrew Fish, on the Last Phase of the Oregon Boundary Question, and a second installment (1848-1849) of the Letters of the Reverend William M. Roberts, third superintendent of the Oregon Mission.

Stanford University has recently acquired the correspondence of Stephen M. White, Democratic senator from California 1893-1899, a large and important collection.

The legislature of Hawaii has recently created an Historical Commission of three members and has appropriated \$15,000 for a period of two years. Professor K. C. Leebrick, formerly of the University of California but now of the University of Hawaii, has been appointed a member of this commission.

CANADA

The September number of the *Canadian Historical Review* contains a discussion of Statistics in Canada, by Gilbert E. Jackson, and an historical paper on the Law of Marriage in Upper Canada, by Hon. W. R. Riddell. The *Review* also reprints Edward Blake's "Aurora Speech" of Oct. 3, 1874, a speech which possesses especial interest at this time because in it are discussed in particular the need for cultivating a national feeling in Canada and the future relations of Canada to the empire.

The house of John Murray, London, is about to publish a *Life of General the Hon. James Murray, a Builder of Canada*, with a biographical sketch of the family of Murray of Elibank, by General Murray's descendant Maj.-Gen. R. H. Mahon.

The Oxford University Press announces the publication of a biography of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, by Professor Oscar D. Skelton, and

Correspondence of Sir John A. Macdonald, selected by his literary executor, Sir Joseph Pope, which in this country is published by Doubleday, Page and Company (pp. xxvi, 502).

The *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society for three successive years, 1918, 1919, and 1920 (volumes XVI., XVII., and XVIII., respectively), have been received. The first is a thin pamphlet of 53 pages and contains articles on the Books of the Political Prisoners and Exiles of 1838, by J. Davis Barnett; a Loyalist of the St. Lawrence (Justus Sherwood), by Henry H. Noble; and a History of the Windsor and Detroit Ferries. Volume XVII. (pp. 174) includes: the Retreat of Proctor and Tecumseh, by Judge C. O. Ermatinger; Some Unusual Sources of Information in the Toronto Reference Library on the Canadian Rebellions of 1837-1838, by Miss Frances M. Staton; Canada's Part in Freeing the Slave, by Fred Landon; British Naval Officers of a Century ago, by Lieut.-Col. D. H. MacLaren; and lastly, in some sixty pages, a Concise History of the Late Rebellion in Upper Canada to the Evacuation of Navy Island (1838), edited by Judge Riddell from the manuscript of George Coventry, who died in 1870. Vol. XVIII. (pp. 110) contains fifteen articles, of which the following are of general interest: Early Navigation on the Georgian Bay, by James H. Rutherford; Ship and Shanty in the Early Fifties, by Rev. Canon P. L. Spencer; a Trial for High Treason in 1838, by Hon. W. R. Riddell; Colonel Joel Stone, a United Empire Loyalist and the Founder of Gananoque, a memoir by Judge H. S. McDonald, which includes some of Stone's correspondence; Pioneer Schools of Upper Canada, by Frank Eames; and Genealogical Tables and their Right Uses in History, by A. F. Hunter.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The August number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* contains three articles: La Primera Negociación Diplomática entablada con la Junta Revolucionaria de Buenos Aires, by Julián María Rubio y Estéban, with a body of documents appended; the Old Spanish Trail, a study of Spanish and Mexican trade and exploration northwest from New Mexico to the Great Basin and California, by Joseph J. Hill; and Some Social Aspects of the Mexican Constitution of 1817, by N. Andrew N. Clevén. There are also a report, by Miss I. A. Wright, of the Second Congress of Hispano-American History and Geography, Seville, May, 1921, and some account of the Archivo General de Indias, by Arthur S. Aiton and J. Lloyd Mecham.

Cuba before Columbus, by M. Raymond Harrington, appears among the *Indian Notes and Monographs* of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation.

The Hispanic Society of America expects before long to publish a volume on *Spanish Colonial Literature in South America*, by Professor Bernard Moses.

J. Humbert is the author of a new *Histoire de la Colombie et du Vénézuéla, des Origines jusqu'à nos Jours* (Paris, Alcan, 1921, pp. 226).

The historical section of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at Buenos Aires has published in a substantial volume a *Relación Descriptiva de los Mapas, Planos, etc., del Virreinato de Buenos Aires existentes en el Archivo General de Indias*, carefully prepared by the director of that archive, Don Pedro Torres Lanzas.

La Vigía Lecor, by Mario Falcao Espalter, is the first in a series of twenty-two volumes, bearing the general title *Historia de la Dominación Portuguesa en el Uruguay* (1815-1829). According to the plan of the work there will be three volumes on the economic régime, seven on the military, eleven on the political, and one devoted to a philosophico-historical sketch of the domination (*Bosquejo Filosófico-Histórico de la Dominación Lusitana*). The present volume, the first of the economic group (Montevideo, Luis y Manuel Pérez, 1919), covers the period 1817-1820. The other two volumes of the economic group, which have the title *Real Hacienda Cisplatina, 1820-1829*, and are by the same author, are in press.

A temperate and judicious study of an Argentinian warrior, historian, and publicist is *Mitre: una Década de su Vida Política, 1852-1862* (Buenos Aires, 1921, pp. 256) by R. Rivarola.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. E. Prussing, *George Washington, Captain of Industry* (Scribner's Magazine, October, November); Lord Acton, *American Diaries*, I. [1853] (Fortnightly Review, November); A. J. Morrison, *The Commerce of the Prairies and Dr. Gregg* (Texas Review, October); B. J. Hendrick, *Chapters from the Life and Letters of Walter H. Page* (World's Work, October-December); Henry Morgenthau, *All in a Life-Time: Chapters from an Autobiography*, cont. (*ibid.*, October-December); T. G. Frothingham, *Our Part in the Strategy of the World War* (Current History, December); W. J. Cunningham, *The Railroads under Government Operation from January 1, 1910, to March 1, 1920* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, October, November); E. S. Gregg, *Failure of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920* (American Economic Review, December); Mark Sullivan, *One Year of President Harding* (World's Work, November); R. Roy, *L'Ancienne Noblesse au Canada* (Revue Canadienne, September, October); T. Chapais, *La Politique Canadienne en 1835* (Le Canada Français, September); A. Raffalovitch, *Le Canada pendant les Six Dernières Années, 1914-1920* (Journal des Économistes, July); J. Conangla Fontanilles, *Pi y Margall y la Independencia Cubana* (Cuba Contemporánea, October, November); M. de Carrión, *El Desarrollo Social de Cuba en los Últimos Veinte Años* (*ibid.*, September); Francisco García Calderón, *Simón Bolívar* (Inter-America, October); G. Porras Troconis, *The Dismemberment of Greater Colombia* (*ibid.*, October); F. Nieto del Rio, *Chile's Conflict with Bolivia and Peru* (Current History, December).

